DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 415 CS 200 468

TITLE	English Teacher Preparation Study, Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English, An Exposition.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.; National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.; National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	Apr 68
NOTE	93p.; Reprinted from English Journal, April 1968
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Ill. 61801 (Stock No. 18858, $1.00 non-member, $0.90 member)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*English Education; *English Instruction; *Guidelines; Inservice Teacher Education; Preservice Education; Professional Education; Professional Training; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Responsibility; Teacher Role; Teacher Supervision; Teaching

ABSTRACT

The first four articles in this collection disucss the importance of the study which developed the Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English and explain the use of the guidelines. Following articles evaluate the teacher's role as a professional, review the history of the preparation of teachers of English, and summarize the history of the English Teacher Preparation Study. The six guidelines with their numerous detailed subheadings--an attempt by the English profession to describe the standards it believes are required for English teaching--are then presented. Concluding articles contain nine short "classic" statements on teacher preparation in English, and describe the elementary and secondary school certification requirements for teaching English in each of the 50 states. (This document previously announced as ED 020 192.) (LH)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 028415

ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION STUDY

Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English

An Exposition

Reprinted from *English Journal*, April 1968

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Council of Teachers of English
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

A Cooperative Study by
National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification
National Council of Teachers of English
Modern Language Association of America
Centered at Western Michigan University

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CONTENTS

An Issue within an Issue:
Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English—An Exposition
Compiled by: Michael F. Shugrue, Modern Language Association and
Eldonna L. Evertts, National Council of Teachers of English

I *An Introduction to the English Teacher Preparation Study*
The Uses of the Guidelines — *Willis H. Umberger* — 475
The Importance of the Study — *John Hurt Fisher* — 477
The Study in Retrospect — *William P. Viall* — 478
Introduction to the Guidelines — *James R. Squire* — 479

II *Teacher Preparation and the English Classroom*
The English Teacher as Professional — *Albert H. Marckwardt* — 480
A History of the Preparation of Teachers of English — *Alfred H. Grommon* — 484
The History of ETPS — *Michael F. Shugrue* — 525

III *English Teacher Preparation Study: Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English—1968* — 528

IV *Classic Statements on Teacher Preparation in English*
- The 1958 NASDTEC Declaration of Policy on Teacher Education and Certification — 537
- From *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English* and "An Articulated English Program" — 537
- "A Standard of Preparation To Teach English" from *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* — 540
- "Resolutions Adopted at a Seminar of English Department Chairmen" — 542
- "Major Recommendations for Educating Teachers of English for the Elementary School" from *The Education of Teachers of English* — 543
- "Major Recommendations for Educating Teachers of English for the Secondary School" from *The Education of Teachers of English* — 544
- "Recommendations To Improve the Quality of Instruction" from *Freedom and Discipline in English* — 544

- "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," ISCPET 546
- "Resolutions of the Anglo-American Conference on the Teaching and Learning of English" 549

V *Certification Requirements To Teach English in Elementary or Secondary School—1967* *Eugene E. Slaughter* 551

A Reprint from

ENGLISH JOURNAL

Vol. 57 April 1968 No. 4

An Introduction to the English Teacher Preparation Study
The Uses of the Guidelines

Willis H. Umberger

Chief of the Bureau of Federal-State-Local Relations
Connecticut State Department of Education
ETPS Advisory Board

IN the preparation of teachers for the schools of America, we may honor the past, but we may not live in it. We pay homage to a great tradition in the development of our institutions and acknowledge the work of those who have struggled to achieve the ideals appropriate to the times. To the extent that these ideals have been achieved, they become the basis for the work we have now to do. The Guidelines have been composed, not as a monument to mark the close of an era, but as the blueprint of a basic design for the promising future.

The Guidelines, then, are not a contribution to the archives to be admired and forgotten. Their purpose is to motivate, to stimulate, and to give a sense of direction to those who plan, and a source of encouragement to those who would improve practices in the colleges. In brief, a document which is to serve as a guide implies motion in the direction of a goal; it is an instrument which, implying principles by expressed exhortations, reveals the aims of those who made it.

But the uses of the Guidelines will be numerous and varied. The state directors of teacher education and certification who had a part in the development of this paper will find it necessary to adapt them so that they will be compatible with state policy written in statutes. The various stages of development in the several institutions pre-

Compilers' Note: The Staff and the Advisory Board of the English Teacher Preparation Study wish to thank the Executive Committee of the NCTE and Richard S. Alm, editor of the English Journal, *for making this exposition of the Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English possible. We hope that the introductory essays, classic statements, and current state certification requirements will prove useful to individual teachers who study the Guidelines, to departments of English and of Education, and to state certification officials.*

Michael F. Shugrue
Modern Language Association
Eldonna Everttts
National Council of Teachers of English

paring teachers may dictate further adaptations.

Indeed, the state director must be constantly aware of two aspects of his work. As the administrator in the state agency charged with carrying out statutory duties, he must clothe the legal mandates with certain interpretations calculated to make the functions of the institutions conform to the needs of present day society. The Guidelines may here serve as a standard of judgment in the evolution of public policy. In the second place, the state director is a professional leader whose purposes include the stimulation and encouragement of improvements in teacher education. He is the catalyst who brings to bear the best thinking of the profession, both philosophers and practitioners, on both the approved programs and those seeking recognition. He must be alert to opportunities wherein he may promote changes which show promise of improvement, and influence those in the complacent institutions who seem not to respond to society's needs. The Guidelines may then serve as a statement of aspirations in the direction of social evolution.

To approve a college program is to exercise a degree of wisdom beyond the abilities of many individuals, who may indeed have some knowledge in one or two fields of learning, but hardly in all of those areas on which they are asked to pass judgment. And to stimulate improvement implies a breadth of understanding as to what constitutes improvement and the direction of progress, a breadth of knowledge and discernment not frequently vouchsafed to those who administer a public office. The Guidelines may serve as a compass as well as a road map.

In the use of the Guidelines, the subject-matter specialist and the professional educator will find the means of harmonizing their purposes. Both are presumed to be intent on preparing teachers who are grounded in significant learning in the field of their major endeavors, and skillful in communicating their knowledge for the profit of immature learners. Scholarship in itself is admirable and essential in the complex civilization which encompasses us; vocationalism is vital and inevitable if a sophisticated social order is to survive. One without the other is empty, and dangerous.

The Guidelines are a joint effort of the National Council of Teachers of English, the Modern Language Association of America, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. Studied, analyzed, debated, repeatedly redesigned and restated, and finally crystalized as presented in this document, the Guidelines represent the best thinking of hundreds of persons, scholars in the related disciplines, teacher educators devoting a lifetime to translating scholarship into action, teachers, and educators with no classroom assignments, consultants from state agencies with a direct interest in the preparation of English teachers, supervisors, writers, school administrators, curriculum directors, interested laymen—a host of persons and institutions deeply concerned with the problems of preserving the best that we have in language and literature, of assuring the best usage attainable through the development of skills, of applying sound scholarship in the schools of America, and of transmitting the rudiments of our culture to a literate people.

Those who use these Guidelines may not be aware of a long standing *Declaration of Policy* adopted by NASDTEC to express its willingness to cooperate in efforts of this kind:

> The members in their respective states, as well as in their national association, will continue to work closely with lay and professional groups and persons to improve programs of teacher education throughout the United States.

Several years have been devoted to the study and preparation of guidelines in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; now at the conclusion of the English Teacher Preparation Study, we can work toward the improvement of the preparation of teachers of English, supported by a general consensus of those who have commitments in this area.

The Importance of the Study

John Hurt Fisher

Executive Secretary
Modern Language Association
ETPS Advisory Board

"AND gladly wold he lerne and gladly teche." Chaucer 600 years ago epitomized the qualities of a good teacher. He must, throughout his life, be as willing to learn as to teach. For the college teacher, this requirement leads to the expectation that he will continue to learn through research and writing, the "publish or perish" that we hear so much about in the news. For the elementary school and high school teacher it generally means inservice study or summer study to keep up with the new methods and materials of the subject he teaches. In any case, the ideal is that the teacher is forever young, forever eager, forever curious.

If it is these qualities of mind and personality that are so important in a teacher, why should we draw up elaborate lists of guidelines for the preparation of teachers? Why not simply take the youngster's pulse and try to guess how soon his arteries will begin to harden. The answer is that any "profession" is devised on the principle of mutual assistance, very nearly like Alcoholics Anonymous. Proper education "conditions" the doctor or lawyer—or teacher—to behave in certain ways. Continuing contact with other members of his profession keeps before the professional person examples of excellent performance, and keeps the professional person in touch with the new ideas and new developments in his field. The hard, grinding work of any job wears one down. When we are tired, we may be refreshed by golf or by building furniture in the basement. We may be equally refreshed by talking shop with our colleagues and seeing how they are dealing with the same problems we face.

Elementary and high school teaching has, up to now, been a quasi profession. Although many people stay with it as a career, many others pass through teaching on the way to marriage, to administration, or to some other career. On the one hand, those of us who deal on the public level with congressmen and taxpayers are striving to see that teaching becomes sufficiently secure and rewarding to hold many more good teachers—and the teachers' unions may achieve these ends much more effectively than our professional groups have been able to do. But the problem is only one-half with the public who support teachers. The other half is with us teachers ourselves. Unless we are willing to set and maintain high standards for our profession—as doctors and lawyers have been willing to do—we cannot demand the pay and the working conditions of professional workers.

The Guidelines of the English Teacher Preparation Study are the sober, serious attempt of the English profession to describe the sort of standards it believes

(Continued on page 550)

The Study in Retrospect

William P. Viall

NASDTEC Executive Secretary
Western Michigan University
Director of ETPS

BY June of 1960 the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) were well into their studies on the preparation of teachers of science and mathematics. At their national conference in San Diego that month, NASDTEC members became acquainted with two visitors from the National Council of Teachers of English, Donald R. Tuttle, then of Fenn College, and Eugene E. Slaughter, of Southeastern State College in Oklahoma, who observed that the preparation of English teachers was as badly in need of improvement as was the preparation of teachers of science and mathematics.

The studies with AAAS continued until August 1963. During that time Genevieve Starcher, NASDTEC member from West Virginia, president of NASDTEC, and a member of the NASDTEC-AAAS Advisory Board, began planning for an English Study with James R. Squire, then Executive Secretary of NCTE. The Modern Language Association of America, which had been concerned with the preparation of teachers of English since the Basic Issues Conferences of 1958 and was cooperating with NASDTEC on the development of Guidelines for programs in the modern foreign languages, was immediately invited to join these discussions.

A special group, including members of the ETPS Advisory Board and dozens of persons from the three co-sponsoring organizations and from Western Michigan University, worked closely to achieve the authority which the ETPS Guidelines possess. One contributor must be mentioned by name—Dr. William P. Robinson, Jr., Rhode Island Commissioner of Education, who represented the Council of Chief State School Officers on the Advisory Board of the science and mathematics studies, helped to draft the proposal for the English Study, and served conscientiously on its Board. Throughout the ETPS he continued to be a rock of dependability.

The help of many organizations outside the field of English deserves recognition: the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the National Commission on Teacher Educational Professional Standards, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Association for Childhood Education International, the Speech Association of America, and the International Reading Association.

MLA, NCTE, and NASDTEC are now working to see that the Guidelines are implemented. Great improvement can take place in the teaching of English in the next few years if these suggestions are studied and used by colleges and universities and by state departments of education.

Introduction to the Guidelines

James R. Squire

Former Executive Secretary
National Council of Teachers of English
Chairman, ETPS Advisory Board

THE development of these Guidelines by thousands of college and university faculty members in English and Education, state directors of teacher preparation and certification, school supervisors and administrators, and by classroom teachers represents the culmination of the first phase of determined cooperative activity to improve the preparation of teachers in our schools. The very fact that so many individuals, representing different scholarly and professional interests and many points of view, could and did arrive at a national consensus is in itself a considerable achievement.

The antecedents of this project are many. They include more than a decade of effort by national and state committees to strengthen state certification requirements in English; they include the preparation of the volume on teacher education by the NCTE Commission on the Curriculum; they include the efforts of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards to open a dialogue on teacher education between scholars and educators; they include the pioneer efforts of the Commission on English to introduce institutes in advanced study in English; they include the influential and highly significant institute program initiated by the United States Office of Education under authority initially provided by the National Defense Education Act; above all they include the continuing joint effort of the Modern Language Association of America and the National Council of Teachers of English, now working closely with the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification and other organizations, to make possible a higher quality of education in English for children in our schools.

But the preparation of the Guidelines is only an initial step. The development of new preservice programs in college departments of English and Education, the institution of bold new programs of continuing education by school districts, and the application of these Guidelines to the needs of education in every state remain the task ahead. The wisdom, hope, and determination which have marked past cooperative efforts must continue for many years if these Guidelines are to serve American education well.

The teachers of English of the United States are grateful to William Viall, Director of this project, to Michael Shugrue and Eldonna L. Everitts, Associate Directors, and to members of the Advisory Board for this important contribution to our professional effort.

II *Teacher Preparation and the English Classroom*

The English Teacher as Professional

Albert H. Marckwardt

Professor of English and Linguistics
Princeton University
Past President, National Council of Teachers of English

THE agreement, by a large number of professionally concerned individuals, upon a set of broad principles governing the preparation of English teachers has implications for many parts of the educational structure. Certainly the teacher candidates themselves will be affected by whatever is developed as a pattern appropriate to their preparation for entry into the profession. Clearly the Guidelines, if taken with the seriousness they deserve, will have an important bearing upon the course offerings in departments of education as well as English. If the educational philosophy and point of view which they illustrate do have an effect on the colleges, they may be expected, with some reason, to influence certification codes and hiring practices. And beyond this, there is the question of their implications for the entire profession.

Before this final matter can be dealt with, however, it is necessary to ask and to answer two questions that are even more fundamental: Are we a profession? If so, to what extent? We must begin with these.

On such a question of definition, I am just enough of a medievalist to delight in etymologies. I am also enough of a student of language to take them less seriously than did Isidore of Seville and the scholastics, but even so they do provide something in the way of contextual clues. I recall that Latin *professus* is the past participal stem of *profitere*, "to declare aloud or publicly." Somehow this reminds one of Hamlet's "Methinks the lady doth protest too much." He might just as well have said "profess." I become even more alarmed when I learn that *fiteri* is related to *fabula*, "fable."

So much then for our lexicographical *jeu d'esprit*. The question which inspired it must still be considered in all seriousness: Are we a profession? We had best begin with a definition to determine just what the hallmarks of a profession are. The much maligned *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* is both sound and illuminating on this point. It defines a profession in the following terms:

> A calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long, intensive preparation, including instruction in skills and methods as well as in the scientific, historical, or scholarly principles underlying such skills and methods, maintaining by force of organization and concerted opinion high standards of achievement and conduct, and committing its mem-

bers to continued study and to a kind of work which has for its prime purpose the rendering of a public service.

As a thumbnail sketch of the characteristics of a profession, this covers the ground more than adequately and is, in fact, the best treatment of the term in any of the conventional dictionary sources. A close examination of the definition shows that in effect there are five elements in the definition:

(a) The requirement of specialized knowledge gained from long and intensive preparation;
(b) The recognition that there must be instruction in the skills and methods of the craft as well as in the historical and scholarly principles underlying it;
(c) The maintenance of high standards of achievement and conduct through the force of organization and concerted opinion;
(d) A commitment on the part of its members to continued study;
(e) The acceptance of public service as a prime purpose in the exercise of the profession.

THESE characteristics are phrased with such clarity as to invite a sober judgment about our present situation with respect to each of them. With respect to the requirement of specialized knowledge, it will be recalled that the NCTE survey of the profession made in 1961 found that, "programs for preparing teachers of English tend to be poorly planned, faulty in emphasis, and unnecessarily inconsistent with one another." The report goes on to say that, "many currently employed teachers of English are deficient in knowledge of their subject and in ways of presenting it effectively." True enough, this was six years ago, but with the many teacher shortages which have plagued sections of the country in recent years, it is difficult to believe that the situation has improved materially since that time. Inadequate preparation is still too much with us.

Unfortunately, from the point of view of our current culture the second criterion is so stated as to place the emphasis somewhat in reverse. We do reasonably well with instruction in skills and methods, or at any rate we devote a considerable amount of time to them. If anything it is the history and underlying principles which are shortchanged. Every NDEA institute director is constantly under pressure to provide practical instruction—courses that will tell the teacher what to do and when to do it. It is most unfortunate that teachers have had little concern for the "why"—for the underlying reasons, the basic philosophy, the fundamental assumptions, those elements which would enable the teacher to decide the what and the when for himself, in terms of the conditions under which he is working.

Incidentally, as a profession we are by no means alone in our concern for the practical. Colleges of medicine and schools of law are often criticized for the amount of attention they give to the theory and principles which lie beneath the day-to-day practice. The orientation to the trade-school approach rather than the professional college pervades many disciplines, even those with a strong intellectual heritage.

The third criterion dealt with the maintenance, by force of organization and opinion, of high standards of achievements and conduct. It is fair to say that for the most part we have the desire to do well. What we actually accomplish may be quite another matter. It is a matter of record that, as recently as 1960, 150,000 secondary school students failed college-entrance tests in English. At that time seven-tenths of the colleges and universities of this country found it necessary to offer remedial work in English. With the constantly increasing number of two-year colleges, the proportion will undoubtedly increase. It is true that if teaching conditions, especially with respect to the number of students per class and the number of class hours per teacher were more favorable, more might be accomplished, but unfortunately the record here is not impressive.

We are told that a profession commits its members to continued study. Certainly teachers have been encouraged to undertake postgraduate studies, but unfortunately the universities have often failed to provide courses well suited to their needs.

In addition, we have tended to measure quantity rather than quality, course hours and credits rather than the growth of the mind. Too seldom have we recognized that the terms, *course* and *study*, are not necessarily synonymous.

Unfortunately, members of college and university faculties have often been derelict in their obligation to furnish leadership, guidance, and encouragement to their colleagues in the schools. To cite just one instance, they have been particularly unimaginative in devising inservice programs, in encouraging independent study and useful action research.

Finally, we are given to understand that the work in which a profession engages has as its prime purpose the rendering of a public service. Here, it would seem, we can genuinely qualify but again this is a matter of purpose and intent rather than actual attainment. To the degree that we are well prepared and do achieve our goals we render a public service; the farther we fall short in the former, the more we fail in the latter.

ALL told, a sober assessment of our success in meeting these five criteria gives us a score of about one and one-half out of five: a percentage of thirty. Unfortunately, this is not a convincing record. It entitles us to say that we have the beginnings of a profession rather than a full-fledged one.

One important point which the Webster definition failed to make was that a profession generally determines its own qualifications for entry into the guild. This is true of all branches of the medical profession and of the law as well. True enough, state certification is a regular practice in connection with them, but the profession controls the certifying agencies. It is the same with the engineers and architects. Only in education have we permitted persons outside the substantive fields to make these decisions, with consequences which have often been unfortunate.

This brings us to the Guidelines themselves. The most significant thing about them is that they come at the problem at the very point which has just been discussed—the self-determination of qualifications. In essence they represent an attempt to arrive at a consensus by a large number of professionally concerned people, as the report says, "to identify areas in which the beginning teacher must have studied," and, "to suggest the direction—as well as the diversity and depth—of further study."

The consensus was not arrived at easily, at least in comparative terms. Some ten years back, a similar statement of qualifications for secondary-school teachers of modern languages required no more than an intensive weekend of work for some ten persons to hammer out three sets of criteria which, in the course of a year, were approved by every professional and scholarly organization in the country which had any concern with foreign-language instruction.

In English, on the other hand, it took seven or eight regional conferences, a national meeting, and twenty-two drafts of the Guidelines, composed and revised over a two-year period to achieve the same result. It is not difficult, however, to account for the difference. At the time, the foreign-language people were concerned solely with instruction in the secondary schools. Moreover, they were describing primarily the teacher's competence in a set of skills. Our problem was far more extensive, both in range and in depth. In addition, professional educators and state certification officers were involved from the outset, and as it turned out, this was a wise move. What is surprising, perhaps, is that we were able to work to a conclusion at all. That we did constitutes an important professional triumph.

Now let us look at some of the features of the Guidelines to see where they are relevant to the concept of a profession as it has been set forth in the earlier part of this discussion. First of all, the emphasis is clearly upon skill and competence rather than courses or credit hours. This is all to the good, centering the attention where it should be. Moreover, it has Conant's approach to teacher preparation as a distinguished precedent.

There is, in addition, an insistence upon literacy; the teacher should be able to speak and write well. Unfortunately, this is not always the case, even with some of the leaders of the profession. Some of the committee reports submitted to me for

comment during my year as president of the National Council of Teachers of English left me in a speechless rage. Some of the papers written by teachers participating in summer institutes make me wonder, when I saw them, how their authors would ever be able to distinguish good writing from bad. Clearly much of this is an instance of "Physician, heal thyself!" and I see no danger of an overdose of medicine.

THE Guidelines show a welcome emphasis upon breadth. For one thing there is the recommendation that the teacher know at least one foreign language. Let us hope that knowledge will be interpreted as the ability to use the language. In addition, they recommend the study of literature written in a language other than English and some exposure to the cultural history of non-English-speaking peoples. Admittedly these recommendations will be difficult to implement, but even a start toward them would eliminate much of the parochialism and naivete with which we are plagued at the present time.

Equally pleasing is the insistence upon underlying theory, fundamental to a true professional approach, as we have already seen. One instance of this is to be found in the insistence upon every teacher's acquaintance with two grammatical systems, on the assumption that this will develop a degree of linguistic sophistication. There is a similar provision with respect to rhetoric, calling for a familiarity with the principles of classical rhetoric and an understanding of their relationship to modern rhetorics. In exactly the same view there is a recommendation that the teacher be familiar with *the* current theories, not *a* current theory of reading.

Also in keeping with this concept of the professional outlook is the stress throughout the Guidelines upon critical awareness of one's self, of language, of literature, of the world. It is this, and the matters discussed in the foregoing paragraph which make of the Guidelines a set of truly professional criteria, something beyond a union-card set of skills.

It conceives of the teacher as operating on a level above that of an educational assembly line. But to operate in this fashion carries a professional responsibility along with it: the teacher must be prepared to make his own judgments, to arrive at his own decisions. Others may furnish him with pertinent facts and information, but the duty of evaluating them is his. The Guidelines are based upon this concept of the teacher's professional role.

Finally, there is an appropriate insistence upon continued study, based upon the concept of growth in the profession as an ongoing process, again a point of view implicit in the Webster definition. Admittedly the goals which the Guidelines set are high, but so is the importance of preparing teachers to deal effectively with the native language and literature. By placing emphasis upon the profession, the Guidelines highlight the fundamental nature of the discipline.

This leads me to sound a final warning. We have gone through one period in our recent educational history when the intellectual disciplines were slighted and almost ignored—to the detriment of the educational process, needless to say. There are disturbing signs that we may be at the threshold of another. This is precisely why we need a strong profession, based upon a strong professional sense, a clear understanding of our aims, a full comprehension of the facts that will support them. A disorganized and confused profession is in no shape to counter the facile and specious arguments of the even more confused prophets of a latter day who seem prepared to sacrifice the fruitful cooperation of the past decade among schoolmen, professional educators, and those whose primary concern is with subject matter. To the extent that the Guidelines can clarify our professional aims, develop our sense of direction and mission, and shape our professional perspectives, to that degree will we be able to defend with force and vigor the values in which we have an abiding faith.

To make this defense, and even better, to move forward on our own, we must be more than 30 per cent of a profession. We must add to what we already have the breadth and depth of learning, a list of sharp critical minds, and the readiness to examine searchingly, to judge rigorously, and to speak out in defense of the educational values we consider to be vital to our nation and indeed to all of humanity.

A History of the Preparation of Teachers of English

Alfred H. Grommon

Professor of Education and English
Stanford University
President, National Council of Teachers of English

THE Guidelines developed in the English Teacher Preparation Study are but the latest in a long line of documents related to the preparation of teachers of English for the schools. The parallels and significant differences in the procedures by which these Guidelines were developed, in the nature and scope of the recommendations, in the sanctions they represent, and in the prospects of their influence may be more apparent, however, when placed in the context of a century of concern with the caliber and preparation of teachers of English. Efforts in this direction a century ago were addressed, first, to establishing the status of English as a school subject; second, to improving the quality and preparation of all teachers; and, third, as English gradually became accepted as a subject, to becoming more concerned with special training for teachers of English.

As early as 1642 and 1647, laws were passed in Massachusetts to establish schools for the teaching of English, largely reading and writing. And in 1749, Franklin justified the importance of English as a part of the program for the academy in Philadelphia. Yet as late as the 1860's and 1870's, English was generally of little importance in American schools and colleges.

But, in 1869, Charles W. Eliot announced his concern with the quality of education offered in our schools and colleges. Upon the occasion of his inauguration as President of Harvard College, he devoted his address to discussing a range of educational problems. Regarding the failure of talks taking place at that time to add much to the "staple of education," he said, "A striking illustration may be found in the prevailing neglect of the systematic study of the English language."[1] He went on to argue for the enlargement of the American educational program extending from the elementary school through college. He stressed that "the needed reformation in methods of teaching the subjects which have already been nominally admitted to the American curriculum applies not only to the university, but to the preparatory schools down to the primary. The American college is obliged to supplement the American school. Whatever elementary instruction the schools fail to give, the college must supply."[2] Then he announced the Harvard faculty's recent decision to establish some admission requirements, including the offering of prizes for reading aloud and "for

[1] Charles William Eliot, *Educational Reform* (New York: The Century Co., 1898), p. 2.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

the critical analysis of passages from English authors."[3]

In 1873-74, however, Harvard changed this entrance examination in English significantly by instituting a test requiring the applicant to demonstrate his ability to use English grammar and rhetoric by writing a composition acceptable to the Harvard faculty on a topic related to certain selections of English literature. Not long after, colleges throughout New England and other parts of the country established their own versions of an admissions examination testing candidates' preparation in English composition and literature.

These examinations, and particularly the canon of set-books upon which the tests were based, had enormous, far-reaching effects upon the importance of English in the schools, the courses of study, the amount of time allotted to the study of English, methods of teaching, and the growing demand for teachers especially trained to teach English. Corollary activities also developed among English teachers but for somewhat different purposes. They objected to the superimposing of a college preparatory program, particularly the long lists of classics picked by the colleges, upon *all* high schools student. Some began to develop programs of writing, language, and literature more in keeping with students not preparing for college. This opposition led to the formation of regional groups of English teachers and ultimately the National Council of Teachers of English.

President Eliot continued his vigorous campaign to establish the importance of English in schools and colleges. In June 1884, he gave an address at Johns Hopkins University on "What Is Liberal Education?" He discussed what he considered to be indispensable components of a liberal education. He proceeded to justify his elevating certain modern subjects to "equal academic value and rank with any subject now most honored." The first is English. He pointed out the contrast between the importance of the array of English writers and the greatness of their literature and the low status of the subject in many schools and its absence from some. He reported that the modest English test required for admission to colleges revealed "the woeful ignorance of their own language and literature which prevails among the picked youth of the country."[4] He went on to explain that "For ten years past Harvard University has been trying, first, to stimulate the preparatory schools to give attention to English, and, secondly, to develop and improve its own instruction in that department; but its success has thus far been very moderate. So little attention is paid to English at the preparatory schools that half of the time, labor, and money which the University spends upon English must be devoted to the mere elements of the subject. . . . This comparative neglect of the greatest of literatures in American schools and colleges is certainly a remarkable phenomenon." Later in the same address he said that "English should be studied from the beginning of school life to the end of college life." This problem of the status of English relative to that of other subjects prompted the Department of Secondary Instruction of the National Education Association in 1887 to approve unanimously a resolution stating that "In the opinion of the department, the English language should be given at least an equal place with that of the classics and science in the high school's course of study."[5]

In many of his talks in the 1880s and 1890s Eliot stressed the importance of developing the school programs and of giving greater importance to certain subjects such as English, history, modern languages, natural sciences, "political economy." But he also emphasized the accompanying need for better teachers, for teachers' examinations, for a better tenure system, for a higher proportion of male teachers, who are more likely than women to make teaching their lifework, for effective supervision of probationary teachers, for teachers "prepared to specialize in teaching one subject" and adapt instruction to children of different

[3] For an account of some of the early history of aspects of English in American schools, see Joseph Mersand's informative essay, "The Teaching of Literature in American High Schools, 1865-1900," *Perspectives on Teaching, Essays To Honor W. Wilbur Hatfield* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960), pp. 271-302.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

[5] *NEA Proceedings* (1887), p. 395.

ages and abilities, and for changing American teaching that tends to be "chiefly driving and judging" to the kind that is "leading and inspiring."[6] In an address to the Harvard Teachers' Association in 1896, Eliot reported that "English has now won a good place in school programmes and in college requirements for admission to college. What a marvel it is that it never had any place at all down to 1873, when it first appeared in the Harvard requirements."

THROUGHOUT the 1890s and the first decade of the twentieth century, the increasing number of articles in professional journals and the initial textbooks on the teaching of English and the training of English teachers testify to the acceptance of the front-rank importance of the field and to the need for teachers especially prepared to teach it. But unquestionably the most significant educational development at the end of the century was the work of the Committee of Ten, appointed by the NEA in 1892 to make a study of secondary school programs. President Eliot of Harvard was appointed chairman of this distinguished committee composed of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the presidents of the Universities of Michigan, Colorado, and Missouri, and of Vassar College, a professor at Oberlin, the headmasters of a boys' and a girls' independent schools, and the principal of a public high school. The Committee appointed a Conference to investigate the programs of each of nine subjects commonly taught in secondary schools. Of the ninety persons who worked on these Conferences, forty-seven represented colleges and universities, forty-two were from secondary schools, and one was a governmental officer who had formerly been on the staff of a university. They studied the programs in over two hundred secondary schools in many parts of the country.[7]

Of concern here, though, are the occasional references in this influential document to the preparation of teachers. In his commentary introducing the reports of the Conferences on the nine subjects, Eliot reminds the reader that throughout each report the Conference states that if schools were to adopt the recommendations for improving the subjects studied in high schools, then teachers of higher academic caliber and with better preparation, especially in effective methods of teaching, would be needed not only in elementary and secondary schools but also in the model schools, normal schools, and colleges in which they are prepared. It was his opinion that these institutions were "capable of making prompt and successful efforts to supply the better trained and equipped teachers for whom the reports of the Conferences call."[8] He particularly called to the attention of colleges and universities their responsibilities for preparing teachers for elementary and secondary schools. The Conference on English made one specific recommendation that the teacher of English:

> must of course be familiar with the more important facts of historical English grammar, and be able to use them in connection with the study of any branch of English, whenever they serve to explain difficulties or to fix grammatical principles. And he must also be able to teach dialects and literary language authority and usage, and the decay of inflections.[9]

Even though this reference seems to be about the only specific recommendation on

[6] Eliot's reference here to the importance of recognizing and adjusting to children's individual differences becomes almost a refrain throughout his addresses, especially in his criticism of schools for the undesirable conformity they insist upon in pupils and in the reforms he proposed. It is also consistent with the system of electives he had already instituted at Harvard. This part of his crusade is in puzzling contrast, however, to the unanimous stands taken in the *Report of the Committee of Ten* (1894), known as "Dr. Eliot's Committee," that schools should make no adjustments in the courses recommended by the Committee for any students, no matter how different their "destinations" might be.

[7] *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (New York: The American Book Company, 1894), p. 11.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

the preparation of the teacher of English, one should not be surprised by this lack. At about the time this Committee and two others were working, many articles on these studies—pro and con—and on other aspects of education in the schools were appearing in professional journals. For example, in the first ten years of *School Review*, 1893-1903, many articles appeared on the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools. But only two were on the English teacher's preparation.[10] And the writers of these two articles seemed concerned almost exclusively with what the individual prospective teacher should get out of experiences in courses in literature and composition and with his personal qualities and abilities. They did not seem to be at all aware of the possibility that colleges might be responsible for offering some kind of program or selection of courses and experiences organized for the benefit of students preparing to teach.

The makeup and procedures of this Committee and its conferences, however, are extremely important. They set a pattern of close cooperation among universities, colleges, schools, and governmental agencies in working on educational problems that is followed to this day. In July 1894, Eliot spoke to the American Institute of Instruction. At that time, his *Report* had been available to the public for six months. In his address, "The Unity of Educational Reform," he proposed to take up some of the criticisms and objections that had already been published, chiefly the question, "What do college men know about the schools?" He pointed out, first, the extensive school experiences of the persons who worked on the Conferences, and, second, that the reforms called for apply throughout the range of the educational system from primary school to university. He closed on this note:

> If I were asked to mention the best part of the contribution which the Committee of Ten have made to the progress of American education, I should say that their general method of work was the best part,—the method of investigation and discussion by subject of instruction,—teachers and experts from all sorts of colleges and universities, and from all sorts of schools, public, private, and endowed, taking part in both investigation and discussion. The Committee's method of work emphasizes the community of interest in all grades, and the fact that experience at every grade is valuable for suggestion and counsel at all other grades. To my way of thinking, the present artificial and arbitrary distinctions between elementary and secondary schools, or between grammar schools and high schools, have no philosophical foundation, and are likely to be profoundly modified, if they do not altogether pass away. . . .
>
> On the whole, the greatest promise of usefulness which I see in the Report of the Committee of Ten lies in its obvious tendency to promote cooperation among school and college teachers, and all other persons intelligently interested in education, for the advancement of well-marked and comprehensive reforms.[11]

THE work undertaken by the Committee of Ten led the NEA to appoint two other committees to study certain aspects of the schools: a Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education[12] and a Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools.[13] The Committee of Fifteen Sub-Committee on the Training of Teachers was composed of five superintendents of public schools representing various sections of the country. On the basis of

---

[10] Samuel Thurber, "The Teacher's Equipment for Work in English Literature," *School Review*, (February 1894); J. F. Genung, "The Teacher's Outfit in Rhetoric," *School Review*, (September 1895). "Equipment" and "Outfit," quaint terms indeed in this context, then seemed to be fashionable diction in discussions of professional preparation to teach.

[11] Eliot, *op. cit.*, pp. 337-339.

[12] *Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education with the Reports of the Sub-Committee: On the Training of Teachers; on the Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education; On the Organization of City School Systems* (New York: The American Book Company, 1895).

[13] *Report of the Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1897).

information and recommendations received through a questionnaire and letters, the Sub-Committee made several recommendations for improving the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools.

One of the more interesting, perhaps prophetic suggestions is that, prior to assuming full responsibility as a practice teacher, the student should begin by teaching for some time a small group of children so that he could study the individual child as he learns new ideas. The student could then learn to modify his lesson plans in order to adapt his subject matter and activities to the "child's tastes and activities." Here is an early version of what is now known as micro-teaching.

The Committee also stressed the importance of the "training" of teachers for secondary schools and for normal schools, claiming that secondary school teachers "give educational tone to communities, as well as inspiration to the body of teachers," and that those who teach in normal schools "need broad scholarship, thorough understanding of educational problems, and trained experience. . . ."[14]

With its recommendation for a postgraduate year of training for teachers, the Committee also anticipated our present fifth year and internship programs. During that year, the student would be employed by the school in which he would do his practice teaching all morning. Afternoons he would attend college classes, particularly those with a "professor of pedagogy," who would also arrange occasional meetings with heads of departments in which the student was teaching. Then on Saturday mornings he would participate in a two-hour seminar conducted by the professor of pedagogy and attended also by the "more ambitious teachers of experience in the vicinity." The Committee reported that such a program for secondary school teachers was planned by Brown University and the Providence High School for the next year.[15] This cooperative arrangement is further evidence of the importance given at that early date to a close liaison between colleges and schools to develop preservice and inservice training of teachers.

A subcommittee of the Committee of Twelve also studied aspects of the supply of teachers: normal schools, training schools in high schools and academies, summer training schools, institutes, provisions for inservice education, teachers' meetings and associations, reading circles, libraries, current literature, the ways teachers were hired, and salaries. The Committee reported that perhaps the most important subject assigned to it was the "training and preparation of teachers." But it did not clarify the distinction between training and preparation.

Two of the Committee's recommendations have particular relevance today. First, it urged normal schools to see that their programs for prospective teachers reflect more than they did "the environment and probable future life of the children in the schools. . . ." The question of relevance is especially acute today in programs preparing teachers to work with disadvantaged schools.[16] Second, it said that communities must show a "clearer appreciation of the qualities essential to a good teacher. It is too often the case that no distinction is made between a teacher of superior scholarship, of proved ability in instruction and discipline, of long experience, and one far inferior in all qualities essential to success."[17]

The historic significance of these committees and their reports at the turn of the century lies, then, not in specific recommendations for the selection and preparation of teachers of English for elementary and secondary schools, for at that time the very place of English as a school subject was in question. Despite Eliot's longtime convictions of its importance and his vigorous support of it in his many addresses,

[14] *Report of the Committee of Fifteen*, pp. 34, 35.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[16] See the chapter on "Teacher Education" in Richard Corbin and Muriel Crosby, eds., *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, Report of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965).

[17] *Report of the Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools*, pp. 77-78.

the report of his own Committee, which a member of the Committee referred to as "Dr. Eliot's report," shows that the majority of the Committee considered English to be of secondary importance, inferior to Latin and Greek. Nor does the significance lie in any influence it might have had on the political aspects of hiring or firing teachers or on ways of judging whether teachers were qualified. Apparently it had none. The importance lies instead in its longtime but debatable influence upon the curricula in the schools and in the Committee's exemplifying the great value of the genuine commitment of the most prestigious representatives of major universities and colleges to help improve education in this country by working closely, and over a long period of time, with superintendents, principals, headmasters, teachers, and representatives of state and federal governments. We still benefit from this rich legacy.

FOR further developments in the growing concern with the preparation of teachers of English between the work of these committees and the founding of the NCTE, we need to turn to the writings of individual teachers. J. F. Genung and the prolific Samuel Thurber have already been mentioned. Texts on the teaching of English began to appear as early as 1887, Alexander Bain's *On Teaching English* (Longmans). Percival Chubb's *The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School*, an influential text, was first published by Macmillan in 1902 but went through revisions as late as 1929. At least two early texts had comments or sections also on the preparation of teachers of English.

B. A. Hinsdale, a Professor of the Art and Science of Teaching at the University of Michigan, published in 1896 *Teaching the Language-Arts: Speech, Reading, Composition* (Appleton). In discussing the qualifications of the teacher of language arts, he gives primary importance to "clear perception of the elements of the arts, their relations to real knowledge, and skill in bringing these elements into connection with young minds." Although he doesn't seem to explain what he means by "real knowledge," he apparently means academic subject matter. He was against the specialization of teachers in elementary schools and departmental method of teaching. He questioned also specialization even in high school where he found it was sometimes "carried to a harmful extent." He predicted, however, that "the time will come when a special teacher of English should be employed."[18]

Of far greater importance in this development is a textbook written by three writers who did believe in specialization in English and in the unification of the subject. They were George R. Carpenter and Franklin T. Baker, Professors of English at Columbia, and Fred N. Scott, Professor of English at the University of Michigan, who wrote *The Teaching of English in Elementary and the Secondary School*, published in 1903 (Longmans). It was revised and reissued up to 1927. Scott wrote the section on "The Teacher and His Training." He discusses the purposes of training in the teaching of English, special and general qualifications, and some components of what the teacher should know and be able to teach.

Scott believed that the main purpose of special training "is to give the teacher, not knowledge of his subject, but self-knowledge; not knowledge of methods of teaching, but resources to meet the exigencies of the classroom."[19] The teacher should be able to "speak and write the English language with clearness, accuracy, and freedom from bookishness" or "schoolmaster's English." He should have extensive knowledge of *both* English and American literature and the history of these literatures. This is probably the earliest stipulation that an English teacher should also know American literature. Scott then offers suggestions on how to read literature and some guides on how extensively the teacher should read. The teacher should know one foreign language well, ancient or modern, even those teaching in the elementary grades. Readers familiar with the experi-

[18] *Teaching the Language-Arts*, pp. 199-200.
[19] *The Teaching of English*, p. 307.

ences of developing the ETPS Guidelines will readily recall the agonizing over this issue. And Scott offers somewhat the same rationale as that presented in the Guidelines: to help the teacher better understand the nature of his mother tongue. He says also that a knowledge of Old English is desirable. He thought that the teacher, however, could study Old English on his own more easily than he could a foreign language.

Scott believed that a teacher's special qualifications should include his learning how to read and "correct" compositions and "scholarship in the history and theory of rhetoric." Aware of the teacher's possible abuse of this knowledge by unloading "his erudition on the class," Scott says that even if this is so, "ignorance of one's subject is no safeguard in the classroom."[20]

He was much exercised about teachers' preparation to teach grammar and their silly notions about language. He says that if it is true that grammar is the worst taught part of the English curriculum, then it is so because so few teachers "have made special preparation for teaching grammar." Continuing in this modern vein, he says that, to him, special preparation included the teacher's becoming acquainted with the best school textbooks, having a knowledge of the development of the English language and of the science of language, and studying the psychology of speech. He wanted the teacher to be rid of "superstitious reverence for grammatical rules" and gain insight into the "true nature of usage and idiom." And what date should we attach to the following?

> From the study of the psychology of speech he will learn through what processes the child acquires his native tongue and how the various elements of this language present themselves to the child-mind at different stages of its development. The total outcome of this study should be to give the teacher a new conception of the meaning of English grammar and its place in the curriculum. He should cease to regard it as a study merely of abstract rules and formulas; he should come to see that the underlying subject is virtually the same as that which underlies composition and literature, namely, the expressive and communicative activities of the English-speaking race. And he should come to see that in teaching grammar his chief duty is to awaken the minds of his students to the meaning of their familiar modes of expression. This knowledge, of itself, if it could be brought home to the consciousness of the teacher, would effect a revolution in the teaching of English grammar.[21]

The year was 1903.

Scott believed that this teacher should also know something about the "underlying principles of literary criticism" so that he can continue to read and study independently without being "bewildered by the contradictory opinions of belligerent critics, or be overawed by the solemn platitudes of self-constituted authorities. . . . He is also less likely to be tainted with the shallow sentimentalism which in some schools takes the place of intelligent appreciation." Finally, he urges him to study comparative literature even though the subject was not yet established. Because he considered the subject important, one certain to gain stature, he recommends that the "ambitious teacher of literature" would do well "to follow with some care the progress of this branch of his chosen subject."[22]

SCOTT'S program in 1903 is much more than a first step in defining specialized preparation for a teacher of English. It is a giant stride reaching far into this century. It anticipates current recommendations and closely parallels some, even his supporting rationale: American and comparative literatures, how to read literature, studying a foreign language, a substantial program in the English language including the modern study of it, methods of teaching and evaluating writing, and especially his emphasis of the importance of studying the "psychology of speech." His awareness of

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 318.

the problems, his sense of the urgencies and realities of what should be done, his commitment to the improvement of the preparation of teachers of English and the teaching of English, all this involvement led Fred N. Scott to join with James Fleming Hosic of the Chicago Normal College and Edwin L. Miller of the Detroit Public Schools to found the National Council of Teachers of English, in 1911.

Scott was the first president of the Council and served during its first two years, 1912-1913. He established much of what is still the pattern of the organization. Because of his prestige as a scholar, critic, author, teacher, and his stature in the Modern Language Association, his influence, according to James R. Squire, did much to win for the Council the respect of members of college and university faculties.

Hosic became Secretary-Treasurer of the Council. In 1912, he established the *English Journal*. Even though he owned it, the *Journal* became the official organ of the Council. Its early issues reveal the increased activities and interests within the Council in the teaching of English, courses of study in the schools, the preparation of teachers of English, and close cooperation between the NEA and this fledgling organization that grew out of the English section of the NEA and its protests against the effects of college admissions examinations in English upon high school English courses and methods of teaching being used to prepare college-bound students for these external examinations. At that time, Hosic was chairman of the NEA Committee on College-Entrance Examinations in English. The Committee's report appears in the *Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA, 1912*, of the meetings held in Chicago, the home of the infant NCTE.

The growing enthusiasm in the 1912 meetings of the English section and in the Council for specialized training in English was tempered somewhat, however, by the strictures expressed by Vincil C. Coulter, Head of the English Department, State Normal School, Warrensburg, Missouri, who spoke on "Desirable Equipment for English Work." He opposed the organizing of subject-matter departments in secondary schools because the advantages blind us to what he saw as being serious disadvantages, one of which was the increasing "demand for more highly trained teachers." He thought that certain kinds of specialization would be a distinct gain for secondary schools. But he objected to the kind of "higher training" that:

> has too often taken the form of advanced training in special lines and has given us teachers who present their material from the standpoint of specialists in history, or science, or literature, rather than from the standpoint of specialists in the education of children. Specialization in English in our universities in the form of the preparation of a "contribution to knowledge," known as the Master's thesis or a Doctor's dissertation, usually has no relation to the preparation for efficient teaching in the schools. In fact, this specialization too frequently results in just so much useless lumber which the unfortunate possessor must get rid of before effective work can be done. This inadequacy in the training of the teachers for the schools brings them to their work unprepared to meet the actual problem of teaching, and unable to take active steps toward the building-up of a working equipment of method and material. The actual work of the English teacher in the school seems to be further removed from the special work he has taken in our universities by way of training than that of any other teacher.[23]

This issue of relevance is, of course, still alive. It was raised by Eliot, by the Committees of Twelve and Fifteen, by Thurber and Scott, by the Hosic Committee on the Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, by Walter Barnes, by the NCTE Curriculum Commission that published *An Experience Curriculum*, by Warner Rice who, while chairman of the Department of English at the University of Michigan, long argued for Ph.D. programs and dissertations in English based upon the recognition that the degree is a *professional* degree for college scholar-*teachers*, and especially by the

[23] *Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA*, (1912), p. 759.

NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged. This question of relevance underlies the rationale and specificity of recommendations in the present Guidelines. This concern about the nature of preparation led the officers of the new NCTE to appoint one of its first committees to find out just what kind of college preparation teachers of English in high schools had had. Its study of the reports submitted by 450 teachers was published in the *English Journal*, May 1915.[24]

THE growing dissatisfaction with the influence of colleges upon high school programs, making them too restrictive and irrelevant for many, if not most, students, a dissatisfaction which led to the founding of the NCTE, also led to the appointment in 1912 or 1913 of one of the most important committees in the development of secondary education: the National Joint Committee on the Reorganization of English in the High Schools. The members represented the newly-formed committee of the NCTE on types of organization of high school English programs and the NEA Committee on College-Entrance Requirements in English. Of special importance to the Council's role is that James Fleming Hosic, one of the founders of the Council, its first Secretary-Treasurer, founder of the *English Journal*, and later president, was appointed chairman of this joint committee. The Committee's point of view and progress reports were presented at the NEA meetings in 1913, 1914, and 1915. According to the reports of those meetings, the hundreds of representative supervisors, principals and teachers from all over the country—people knowledgeable about public schools and their English programs—enthusiastically endorsed the work of the Committee.[25]

Although the Committee's *Report*, often called the "Hosic Report," is best known for the recommendations for reorganizing English programs in public secondary schools, the Committee also offered comments upon and recommendations for the preparation of teachers. It recognized the main facts the NCTE had reported on the preparation of high school teachers of English, but it also agreed with that committee's conclusion "that as yet the question as to what constitutes the best preparation for the English teacher has not been widely or thoroughly considered."

In two statements expressing its point of view, the Committee focuses attention upon the importance of the quality of teachers:

> 11. Finally, the success of English work is conditioned by certain material and personal factors, the most important of which are the number and size of classes, the library and other equipment, and the preparation of the teacher. . . .
>
> 13. The supreme essential to success in high-school English is the trained teacher—the teacher trained by the study of his subject, by the study of educational principles and methods, and trained by experience. The novice and the itinerant—often one and the same—are the chief stumbling blocks to progress in English as in other fields. They must give way to the professional imbued with the sympathetic spirit. Such a person will have rational standards, mature judgment, and definite methods of measurement.[26]

Most of the report is an early textbook on methods of teaching English in secondary schools relevant to the Committee's point of view and program. In discussing methods, the Committee states that the "chief problems, materials, methods, all

[24] The Committee received 450 replies to 1500 questionnaires. Of these 450 high school teachers of English, 90 per cent had a college degree; 50 per cent specialized in college English, that is, took five or more English courses in college; about 50 per cent had some specialized training in the teaching of English. Those who had had this special training reported that in general they found it helpful. Some of them reported, however, that their other courses in education were too theoretical.

[25] James Fleming Hosic, compiler. *Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools*, Bulletin No. 2. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1917), p. 28.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

have immediate implications for attitudes of teachers and preparation for teaching,"[27] and later comments upon the "lamentable lack of any true pedagogy of English teaching."[28]

The Joint Committee did not make the needed comprehensive study of what constitutes the best preparation for high school teachers of English. That attempt did not come until the 1960s. But it did comment generally upon the matter and offered two sample programs of what it was talking about. It opens its special section on the preparation of teachers with the following statement about the nature of the act of teaching of English and the implications it saw for the preparation for such teaching:

> The difficulty is that mastery of English does not consist in the learning of facts and rules nor in mere mechanical skill. Communication is an art. . . . It is, indeed, not a task for a mere scholar accustomed to having bodies of facts presented in lecture form from the teacher's desk. It requires knowledge, but also skill—skill in using that knowledge in the guidance of others.[29]

Here the Committee is making somewhat the same kind of distinction that Coulter had made in 1912.

The Committee took from the *English Journal*, May 1916, a description of a program planned by the University of Southern California, which required the candidate to complete four years of college and a graduate year. It provided extensive studies in English, foreign languages, history, public speaking, philosophy, and education, together with a special course in the teaching of high-school English, which would meet for three hours a week throughout the graduate year. At the same time, the candidate would be doing his practice teaching four periods a week and have a course in school management two periods a week.

The Committee also reported some general information about offerings for teachers of English and stipulated what it considered to be essentials:

> Inasmuch as almost all the larger colleges and universities of the country have begun to offer special courses for the training of high school teachers, particularly in their summer sessions, it seems likely that in the near future such courses may become reasonably standardized.

Although the Committee had acknowledged earlier it did not know what "constitutes the best preparation for the teacher of English," it proceeded to do what others have since done: specify what *it* considered indispensable:

> (1) studies in the nature and elements of the various literary types, in addition to a broad reading knowledge of English and American literature, (2) sufficient training in oral and written composition, including public speaking, (3) a course in the application of educational principles to the teaching of English in high school, and (4) active practice under direction. . . . Preliminary steps have been taken in certain states to demand specific professional training of all high school teachers, and it is certain that it is only a question of time until this will be a common practice.[30]

Specialists in English education today might not quarrel with what is included in these recommendations but would question serious omissions when compared with the scope of the ETPS Guidelines, or even with Scott's calling in 1903 for an enlightened attitude toward language, for substantial training in the English language and a foreign language, preparation in the psychology of speech and in the processes through which children acquire their native speech, the ability to write and to teach and evaluate compositions, the study of comparative literature and literary criticism, in addition to studies in English and American literature. Scott's analysis of the

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 147.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

kind of preparation needed is both more penetrating and considerably more forward-looking than are the generalizations offered by Hosic's Committee. But the Joint Committee did introduce a new feature that has gotten a great deal of vigorous attention since the middle of the 1950's: the certification of teachers.

The Committee also included a brief description of a then recently established graduate degree at the University of California that required, in addition to other features, at least four years of professional experience and two full years of graduate study. At least by 1917, patterns of five-year and six-year programs of teacher education resembling some of those today had already been established.

In the light of recent developments in appointing specialists as supervisors of English in several states, another set of recommendations in the section on the preparation of teachers may be of special interest. The Committee included remarks on the inservice education of teachers made by Clarence D. Kingsley, High School Inspector, Massachusetts Board of Education, who advocated the following activities for State directors of high school English:

1. Visit English teachers in their classrooms so as to discuss their individual problems.
2. Confer with groups of teachers regarding common problems.
3. Issue bulletins embodying the results of successful experimentation, giving references to useful materials.
4. Revise from time to time State manuals on the teaching of English.
5. Make arrangements whereby State directors of English could, in alternate years, serve as instructors in institutions preparing teachers of English. In this way, they could bring to the preparation of teachers an intimate knowledge of the needs of the schools, and during the years in which they were acting as field agents they could know what preliminary training the teachers had received.[31]

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

As this 1917 report indicates, the awareness of some possibilities of preservice and inservice programs was expanding. Whereas the Committees of Ten, Twelve, and Fifteen had merely pointed out the need for better teachers in general to implement their programs, Hosic's Committee offered a point of view, policies, recommendations, and sample programs specifically for teachers of English. The report had its greatest impact, however, as the culmination of the widespread revolt against twenty or thirty years of restrictive high school English programs geared mainly to priming students for college admissions examinations. It would be more than a decade before another sizable group of English teachers and professors would develop the point of view of the Hosic Committee into a full-blown English curriculum, kindergarten to graduate school.

But during the intervening years, individual teachers carried on the revolution by showing how the philosophy of the Hosic Committee could be made to work in the day-to-day classroom teaching of English, by pointing out some implications for the preparation of teachers, and by anticipating the next major curriculum development. One was Walter Barnes. At that time, he was head of the English Department at Fairmont State Normal School, Fairmont, West Virginia. He later became Professor of English Education at New York University. He was teacher, author, editor, and lecturer on the teaching of English. Three of his lectures to teachers of English in the schools and colleges in Western Pennsylvania and West Virginia—"Making English Democratic" (1918), "Democratic Ideals of Culture and Efficiency: Their Relation to English" (1919), and "The Palace of Pedagogy" (1920)—were published together in *The New Democracy in the Teaching of English*.[32]

Throughout his lectures, Barnes emphasizes the importance of teachers' attending democratically in the classroom to the wide range of students' characteristics, needs, experiences, abilities, interests. This point of view permeated also the discussions and pa-

[32] (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1923).

pers during the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English held at Dartmouth College in 1966. It is treated in some detail by John Dixon and Herbert J. Muller, authors of two reports on the conference, but particularly by Muller in his second chapter, "Democracy in the Classroom," of his report, *The Uses of English*.[33]

In his lectures, Barnes vigorously attacks what he considered to be the dull, stultifying, largely irrelevant English programs, attitudes, and teaching methods visited upon democratic public high schools by aristocratic colleges and universities. He was, it now seems, an earlier Ben DeMott, a one-man traveling Dartmouth Conference, in his attitudes towards English and the teaching of it.[34] Although we presumably are concerned here with the relevance of Barnes' ideas on the education of teachers of English, we first need a taste of the DeMottian flavor and attitudes toward literature, talk, language, and writing. In talking about the traditional, aristocratic treatment of literature, Barnes says:

> Our favorite blunder is presenting this literature as fine art, to be studied and analyzed as specimens of art, instead of as documents of life, romantic or realistic, to be observed and reflected upon as fragments of existence. . . . Are we taking up a drama of Shakespeare's? Instead of reading rapidly through the play, following the story, and comparing it with life as the children have observed life, getting acquainted with the characters and watching them act and react upon circumstances and upon one another, noting passages of wisdom and eloquence with which the pages of Shakespeare are so generously strewn; instead of treating the play as a cross-section of human existence, we must study the sources of the plot and conjecture why the author modified them, we must learn the architecture of the play, the exposition, rising action, and so forth . . . —all matters of interest to the technician, to the student of the art of stagecraft, to the dwellers of the Palace [of Pedagogy on the Hill], but of no concern to the inhabitants of the plains.[35]

Instead, teachers should see that "Literature is alive as long as it has life, and it has life as long as it influences life," and that "A bit of literature can have no effect upon a child if it makes no appeal to him, if it fails to come home to his heart and bosom."[36] Quite in keeping with the recommendations growing out of the Dartmouth Conference, Barnes in 1918-1920 emphasizes throughout his lectures the importance of talk, the use of English in everyday life, idiomatic speech, the merits of effective, vigorous slang, relating writing to students' personal experiences, the "paramount importance of oral expression."

This is the spirit, the attitude he wanted colleges to help foster in students preparing to teach English. He did not presume to know, however, what English should be taught in colleges and universities. But he believed that some of it should be related to the subject-matter and methods of teaching English in high schools, that future teachers should study modern literature, including fiction and poetry, modern newspapers and magazines, and oral expression in its various forms. It is not the program he asked for in college English departments but the freshness of outlook, the commitment to the acceptance of children as they are, the importance of making all aspects of English relevant to and meaningful in the lives of students—all these qualities now so urgently in demand among teachers today are what recommend Barnes' contributions to the attention of those interested in

[33] John Dixon, *Growth Through English* (Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967); Herbert J. Muller, *The Uses of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967).

[34] Professor DeMott is chairman of the Department of English, Amherst College. He was a participant in the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English held at Dartmouth. For his inveighing against what he called the traditional "Lit. Hist." and "Lit. Crit." point of view toward the nature of literature and the teaching of it, see his article, "Reading, Writing, Reality, Unreality. . . ." *Educational Record*, (Summer 1967) 197-205.

[35] *The New Democracy in the Teaching of English*, pp. 29-30.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 17.

preparing students to move into the plains, suburbs, or ghettos to teach English. Barnes also turns up in later developments.

THE stirrings symbolized and accelerated by the 1917 *Report on the Reorganization of English and Secondary Schools* and by individuals such as Walter Barnes created considerable activity among English teachers interested in developing curricular materials and among leaders in the NCTE. Many teachers and administrators engaged in developing materials throughout the 1920's wrote to the NCTE headquarters to request copies of the Council's curricular materials. It had none. As viewed by the Council's leaders, the circumstances seemed to be these:

> The Reorganization Report was of course recommended, but since 1917 the social situation upon which the curriculum should be based had changed materially; the character of the school population, especially in the high school, had changed; the junior high school had grown from an experiment into an accepted institution; educational thinking and general practice had made material advances; more detailed outlines had come into fashion; new materials were available for literature courses; and, most important of all, the Reorganization Report covered only Grades 7-12 whereas any thoroughly effective training in English must be planned from the kindergarten up.[37]

In recognition of these circumstances, the NCTE Executive Committee approved in November 1929, President Ruth Mary Weeks' proposal that a Curriculum Commission be appointed to create an English curriculum to be recommended for use from kindergarten through graduate school. There were two especially significant features of the sponsorship of this ambitious project and of the membership of the Commission. First, President Weeks obtained the support of the following educational organizations; each was represented on the Commission: National Education Association, American Association of Teachers Colleges, National Association of Teachers of Speech, National Association of Journalism Advisers, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Second, the membership of the Commission represented the full range of our educational system and all parts of the country. W. Wilbur Hatfield of the Chicago Normal College, who had succeeded Hosic as Secretary-Treasurer of the NCTE in 1919 and served in this capacity until 1953, was appointed to the chairmanship of the Steering Committee. Throughout the membership of the fifteen committees more than 100 representatives of schools, colleges, and universities worked closely together, thus following in the pattern established by the Committee of Ten in 1892. Of special interest in this account of the English teachers' growing awareness of the importance of the individual student and his experiences as a major basis for an English curriculum is that Walter Barnes, then of New York University, was a member of the Steering Committee and co-chairman with Hatfield of the Secondary Level Committee on Literature.[38]

The publication of *An Experience Curriculum* in 1935 represents in a sense—almost two decades later—a fulfillment of the promise and directives in the Reorganization Report of 1917: a pattern curriculum for English, Grades K through graduate school, based upon the principle that "Experience is the best of all schools" and that school and college curriculums should consist of experiences, that is, "well-selected experiences."[39] The rationale and patterns illustrate how all strands and materials of an English program can be designed to accommodate the wide range of individual differences among students, to capitalize upon experiences in and out of school, and to foster each child's creativity. At a time when apparently an increasing number of American teachers of English are now showing interest in what may seem to many to be points of view and methods of

[37] W. Wilbur Hatfield, *An Experience Curriculum in English*, A Report of the Curriculum Commission of the NCTE (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935), p. ix.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. ix-xvi *passim.*

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

teaching English newly fashioned by British teachers of English as reported in the Dartmouth Conference, they should also turn back fifty years to see that in such documents as the 1917 *Report on the Reorganization of English*, the lectures by Barnes, and particularly *An Experience Curriculum* much that may now seem quite revolutionary coming out of Dartmouth had been put before us long ago.

BUT somehow many of us, especially the opinion-makers among us, seemed to have lost or discredited this sense of direction—until this current convergence of exciting, sensible ideas imported from the British largely through the Dartmouth Conference and of our own sudden, jolting realization that much of what we have been doing in our English classes simply is no longer relevant for today's youth. Perhaps we lost the impact of *An Experience Curriculum* because it—and all else—were soon overshadowed by the dreadful substance of World War II. The discrediting followed in the early 1950s, especially as represented by Bestor, Lynd, and the Council on Basic Education.[40] Bestor's title, *Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools*, clearly announces his judgment. He equates an experiential curriculum with anti-intellectualism and a lack of faith in intellectual endeavor and progressive education, as he understands it, with regressive education, and "Life-Adjustment Training" becomes "A Parody of Education." He then presents his own program for the "Reorganization of Teacher Training" in which he recommends practically abolishing work in professional education with the exception of supervised teaching. However, he also chides academic departments for not taking a more active part in preparing teachers. Lynd also tries to annihilate "Educationists" and "Educationism" for their role in perpetuating quackery in public schools. Today, however, some academicians, particularly those who participated in the Dartmouth Conference, applaud and popularize the recent rediscovery of the importance of students' experiences, imagination, creativity, and the efforts to make English relevant—right now. They seem to think of this present form of an experience curriculum, however, not as a return to concepts of progressive education but rather as a "humanitarian" education.[41]

But perhaps another factor may also have contributed to the loss of the significance and momentum the experienced curriculum symbolized: an unfortunate weakness in what should have been one of the report's most important sections but one that apparently was and still is overlooked—"Teacher Education in English," buried in Appendix C, last in the book.

If the Commission had hoped to prepare and inspire succeeding generations of English teachers to understand, try out, evaluate, and improve a curriculum based upon selected experiences, then surely it could have given teacher education a much more prominent role in the future of the curriculum. Maybe, too, it should have applied more fully the pattern strands. Although strands of students' experiences are explicitly developed and illustrated from kindergarten on into college, they are virtually ignored in the program of teacher education offered in the modest section at the close of the volume.

The Committee on Teacher Training introduces its program by properly stressing the importance of some criteria for the careful selection of students preparing

[40] Arthur E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools* (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1953).

Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1953).

James R. Koerner, ed., *The Case for Basic Education* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1961).

[41] For an analysis of these differences see James E. Miller, Jr., "Literature in the Revitalized Curriculum," *The English Curriculum in the Secondary School, The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Number 318, April 1967. Professor Miller was a participant in the Dartmouth Conference. In reviewing four stages of the development of the curriculum, he says, in part: "We are now, in my view, on the threshold of the fourth stage, which I call the Humanitarian. . . . [It] is and will continue to be radically different from the Progressive stage before it" (p. 26).

to become teachers of English. And it also emphasizes the importance of an experience curriculum within the program of teacher education, but for the *candidate*: he should have such experiences as "travel, field work, case studies, research, journalistic and literary publications, dramatics, pageantry, dance drama, puppetry," and culminating, of course, in practice teaching or internship.[42]

Then the Committee presents somewhat detailed descriptions of realistic programs for the preparation of teachers for elementary schools, for those preparing to teach English in junior and senior high schools, and for those intending to use English as a teaching minor or supporting subject, all extending for at least four years and some for five. Each is designed to help the candidate improve his ability to speak, write, read, and to read aloud and interpret effectively literary selections; increase his knowledge of a wide range of literature, including literature for children or adolescents, contemporary literature, myths, legends, sacred writings, world literature, as well as English and American, literary criticism, and of objective studies of students' reading development that will help the teacher select and teach literature and stimulate the individual's reading interests accordingly; and acquire the ability to teach a variety of reading skills. In addition, those interested in teaching in secondary schools should have courses in advanced composition, including creative writing, history of the English language, including current usage problems and an interpretation of Leonard's *Current English Usage*,[43] and present day grammar. The professional preparation should be built around supervised teaching but also include methods of remedial teaching and a course in special materials and methods of teaching various components of English.

The practical programs outlined in this volume closely resemble those in use today, perhaps are superior to some. They are quite in keeping with recommendations in the ETPS Guidelines. Good as they are, however, they also reveal a major weakness, at least as described in the report. Their product still might not be prepared to implement in his teaching and associations with children the principles and procedures essential to a curriculum based upon students' experiences. The only kinds of experiences even mentioned throughout this section on teacher education are those of the candidate himself. There is no explicit directive to college faculties about the importance of their accepting the centrality of students' experiences as a major factor in their learning. Nothing is said about the importance of the candidate's knowing about *An Experience Curriculum* and about his learning how to identify and capitalize upon students' experiences during his experiences in working with case studies and in observations, field work, supervised teaching, and, later, inservice education.

Apparently the Committee on Teacher Training and, presumably, the entire Commission had merely assumed that the merits of the experiential curriculum were sufficiently self-evident that college faculties, future teachers, and supervisors of directed teaching would, of course, automatically mine the gold therein. Perhaps too few did. Perhaps too much had been assumed. And perhaps also herein lies a warning to the organizations sponsoring the present Guidelines not to assume that now they are readily available to everyone the values of the suggestions are self-evident enough to recommend themselves immediately to institutions preparing teachers of English, to state certifying agencies, and to districts offering programs of inservice education.

IN the decade following the publication of *An Experience Curriculum*, many individuals published reports of studies of varying scope. The most ambitious were those conducted by Dora V. Smith of the University of Minnesota and President of the NCTE in 1936-37. Throughout much of the 1930s she was engaged in significant research into the teaching of English in public elementary and secondary schools. She reported her findings and evaluations in three volumes.[44] From these investiga-

[42] *An Experience Curriculum*, pp. 312-315, *passim*.

[43] Sterling Andrus Leonard, *Current English Usage* (Chicago: NCTE, 1932).

[44] *Instruction in English*, Monograph No. 20 of the National Survey of Secondary Education,

tions, especially from her visits to numerous classrooms and her inquiries into programs of teacher education, she extracted implications for the preparation of teachers of English. These she reported in two articles. In the first, "The Academic Training of High-School Teachers of English,"[45] she recommends that the future teacher have strong preparation in liberal arts: history, "as wide range of natural science as possible," appreciation of music and art, and an understanding of basic questions in social sciences and geography. More closely related to his teaching field is training in speech, oral interpretation of literature, in the use of major reference sources in libraries and classification of books and other materials, journalism, and dramatic arts. She recommends within the English major studies in the "major contributions of English, American, and in certain instances, world literature, taught sometimes by types, sometimes by theme, and sometimes by chronology," contemporary literature, informative prose, literature for adolescents, and the historical development of the English language, showing the "inevitability of linguistic change." She pleads for a sense of reality throughout this program and for a five-year program of teacher education.

The following lengthy quotation taken from Professor Smith's report on the "Implications of the New York Regents' Inquiry for the Teaching of English" is presented here because in it she points out the relationships between the needs of teachers of English as she saw them in her visits to their classes and in talking with them and the preparation then offered by colleges and universities in New York State. This question of relevance was also a part of the inquiry made some twenty years later by the NCTE Committee on National Interest in preparing its report, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*.[46] The same questions will inevitably arise in applying the Guidelines to programs throughout the country.

> [The New York State Syllabus in English] presupposes training on the part of English teachers in written composition, oral expression, and usage, including trends in the historical development of the English language. In reading, it requires a general knowledge of English and American literature, with emphasis upon type rather than chronology, and upon recent centuries rather than pre-Shakespearean periods. It assumes on the part of teachers a wide reading of all types of literature, including biography and informative prose of recent decades. In addition, it requires acquaintance with the best books available for adolescents, knowledge of current magazines and newspapers, and understanding of library techniques and reference sources useful at the high school level.
>
> Comparison of these needs with the teaching-training programs in eleven colleges and universities training 65 per cent of the English teachers in the high schools visited reveals an urgent need for reconsideration of the whole problem of teacher-training in terms of the requirements of the secondary school. Only two of the eleven institutions require a course in speech of prospective teachers of English. Cornell University offers a course in oral expression for teachers, recognizing the importance of voice control, tone quality, and articulation for those who would guide pupils in the classroom, and taking into account the social aspects of speech emphasized in *An Experience Curriculum*. Courses in the history of the English language are offered in eight out of eleven institutions but are required in only one. Whether these deal with the inevitability of linguistic change and acceptable standards in current usage it is

Bulletin No. 17, 1932 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office). New York Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education, *Evaluating Instruction in English in the Elementary Schools*, by Dora V. Smith (National Conference on Research in English, Research Bulletin No. 8, 1941). New York Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education, *Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English*, by Dora V. Smith (English Monograph No. 11, National Council of Teachers of English, 1941).

[45] *Harvard Educational Review*, (March 1938).

[46] (Champaign: NCTE, 1961).

impossible to tell. The largest portion of the English major requirements for degrees in New York State is devoted to literature. The emphasis is upon chronology rather than upon type, and the content is English and traditional to the exclusion of the American and the contemporary. Fewer than one-third of the institutions require a course in American literature of prospective teachers of high school English. Two offer no course in the American field. Five, however, present certain courses in literary types which undoubtedly include both English and American material. No institution requires work in contemporary literature, and only one a course in adolescent literature and library reference for high schools. The seriousness of the problem may be illustrated by the fact that one college which trains approximately one-half of the English teachers in the schools visited in a great city system requires a twenty-four credit major in English, nine of which must be in Anglo-Saxon and Middle English, and none at all in speech, contemporary literature, American literature, or books for adolescents. Is it any wonder that studies of the voluntary reading of high school pupils bring discouraging results? In contrast to this is the program being developed at the University of Syracuse, which patterns its courses rather directly upon the needs of the high school teacher in the state and the nature of the cultural influence it is desirable that he or she exert in the community. [This program was designed by Professor Helene Hartley. Her ideas on the preparation of teachers of English will be discussed later.]

In this connection I am concerned, as a member of a teacher-training staff, with the fact that much of the poorest, most old-fashioned teaching in the New York schools is being done by the graduate but one or two years removed from the training college, where he has in many instances been taught better modes of procedure. The conditions surrounding teaching in the large cities are being studied by local and national groups. Those surrounding the young, inexperienced teacher almost totally without supervision in the field may well challenge the attention of organizations like ours [NCTE].[47]

In her report, *Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English* (1941), Professor Smith mentions some other inadequacies among teachers she thought should be brought to the attention of institutions preparing teachers. Because she found that many of them were unaware of the results of research related to the very teaching problems they were encountering, she states that "It is imperative, if mere personal argument is to be superseded by a scientific approach to the problems of curriculum making and instruction in English, that teachers be acquainted during their preservice training with the major findings of research in their own field."[48] She also found only one out of ten of all the English teachers she worked with in this study had read *An Experience Curriculum*, an official publication of the NCTE which she claimed had done "more than any other single volume to stimulate thought concerning practices in teaching English throughout the country."[49]

PROFESSOR Smith's comments about college English requirements in the 1930s might be compared to results obtained in 1960 from 454 institutions by the NCTE Committee on National Interest in its study of programs for preparing teachers of English in secondary schools. Some encouraging changes in college requirements had occurred during the twenty-two years but not as much as might be hoped for. The Committee found that 86.8 per cent of the institutions required a survey of English literature; 83.7 per cent required a survey of American literature, a substantial increase over what Miss Smith had found in New York State; 37 per cent, a survey of

[47] *English Journal*, 28 (March 1939) 188. This article is also included in Dora V. Smith, *Selected Essays* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 317-336.

[48] *Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English*, *op. cit.*, p. 257.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 216.

world literature. Although the number is still low, the 21.1 per cent requiring courses in contemporary literature, 29.1 per cent, a course in literary criticism, 38.8 per cent courses in literary types, and 15.9 per cent, courses in literature for adolescents, 41 per cent, a course in advanced composition, and 17.4 per cent, a course in modern English grammar[50]—all these percentages represent some gains in requirements for future teachers over those of the 1930s. Yet the Committee found that much work has to be done to give more reality to programs for preparing teachers of English. Echoing Miss Smith's remarks of two decades earlier, the Committee states that still

> The most notable deficiencies [in the preparation to teach literature] are in the areas of world literature and contemporary literature and in the apparent indifference of colleges to educating teachers in methods of literary criticism. The overwhelming majority of colleges do not require a course in literature for adolescents. Although students may elect work of these kinds in most institutions, the absence of any widely held requirements suggests that existing programs in teacher education tend to neglect preparation in these areas.[51]

The chances for more accelerated improvements in the near future, however, should be somewhat better. The ETPS Guidelines not only exist, but they also represent a consensus of a wide cross-section of the profession. The specific recommendations related to what goes into courses offer a means of looking behind course numbers and titles to see just how relevant the concepts, content, and procedures are for future teachers. Furthermore, the Guidelines are endorsed by MLA, NCTE and by the representatives of both organizations who may be in the most strategic position of all to put the Guidelines to work in English courses, the departmental chairmen who are members of the Association of Departments of English. And now a new group of participants has been introduced: the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. It could be that English departments preparing teachers may have some difficulties in overlooking the Guidelines from now on.

But whether these marshalled forces equipped with shining new Guidelines will actually bring about recommended changes that will surface in future surveys and thereby show that colleges and universities have taken seriously the realities of preparing teachers of English may depend in part upon the whole enterprise's finding answers to questions posed by Dora V. Smith thirty years ago. How do the requirements and options in preservice programs relate to the realities of teaching English in the varieties of schools and communities? How are changes brought about in programs that are largely irrelevant to the kinds of teaching called for in the schools?[52] What can be done to acquaint teachers with the results of respectable research in their own fields and then help them use the results in their teaching? How can we stimulate teachers to continue to read the professional literature in their field? How can institutions and school districts help teachers keep from returning to outmoded concepts, materials, and methods of teaching soon after they have completed their preservice preparation?[53]

---

[50] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, pp. 60, 81, 82, 84 *passim*.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[52] In 1967, Professor Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota, provided the profession with an outstanding example of how such changes might be brought about. He planned and conducted a series of meetings for representatives of all the colleges and universities in Minnesota engaged in preparing teachers of English to acquaint them with the Guidelines and their use in these institutions.

[53] This observation made by Dora V. Smith was later investigated by Professor Alice Scofield of San Jose State College. Through her study of the teaching methods used by about one hundred teachers of English who were completing their first five years of teaching, Mrs. Scofield found that many of these teachers tended to use methods generally disapproved of by specialists in English Education. For more information on this study see Alice Fulmor Gill Scofield, *The Relationship Between Some Methods of Teaching Language Arts as Advocated in Methods Courses and as*

THE research and extensive writing accomplished by Professor Smith during the 1930s and early 1940s actually constitute a benchmark in the development of programs for the education of teachers of English. These notable achievements, her many other contributions to the profession, and her admirable personal qualities indicate very clearly why the Executive Committee of the NCTE unanimously chose her to be the Director of a new Commission on the English Curriculum established in 1945.

Thus began the most ambitious curriculum project yet undertaken by the Council. The representation among the thirty-one members of the Commission and the 175 members of its committees followed the pattern established in 1892 by Eliot's Committee of Ten and the ninety members of its nine Conferences: the full range of our educational system, including one college president, and all parts of the country. According to the Director, "In addition, more than three hundred and fifty school systems in the course of the study borrowed and tried out materials and contributed examples from their own system."[54] The Executive Committee asked the Commission "to examine the place of the language arts in life today, to examine the needs and methods of learning for children and youth, and to prepare a series of volumes on the English curriculum based on sound democratic principles and the most adequate research concerning how powers in the language arts can best be developed."[55] To fulfill this charge, the Commission published five volumes known as the Curriculum Series: *The English Language Arts* (1952), *The Language Arts for Today's Children* (1954), *The English Language Arts in the Secondary School* (1956), *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (1963), and *The College Teaching of English*.[56] Of direct concern to this report is Volume V, *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges,* which will be discussed later.

A statement that does fit here chronologically, though, was written by a member of the curriculum Commission, Chairman of its Committee on Reading and Literature, and President of the Council in 1945-46, the late Professor Helene W. Hartley of Syracuse University. Under the chairmanship of Max J. Herzberg, member of the Executive Committee and a Past President of the Council, a committee of leaders in the NCTE contributed papers on *The Emerging Curriculum in English in the Secondary School,* which constitute the entire issue of *The Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, February 1946. Miss Hartley's paper is on "The Preparation and Selection of Teachers of English," in which she discusses aspects of academic preparation and related personal attributes.

She bases the criteria for selecting future teachers of English and for planning an appropriate program upon what a teacher of English is expected to do in the "emerging high school." It will be recalled that in her report on the Regents' Inquiry Dora V. Smith commended Professor Hartley's program at Syracuse for being closely related to the realities of teaching English in public schools. Professor Hartley states that the *kind* of English major offered a candidate is more important than the *fact* that he has a major. She, too, criticizes majors that consist almost entirely of courses in literature. Literature there must be, of course. She recommends including studies of "carefully chosen masterpieces of the great literatures of the world . . ." as well as English, American, and contemporary. To help the future teacher guide students' reading of literature he should have read widely and continue to read, should be able to read aloud effectively, and should be able to teach reading skills.

Among the essentials of his preparation as a teacher of speaking and writing, he should of course be able to speak and write effectively and should be prepared to give much more attention to oral communication

Practiced in the Classroom. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation (Palo Alto: Stanford School of Education, 1955).

[54] The Commission on the English Curriculum, *The English Language Arts* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952), p. viii.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. vii.

[56] All were published for the Council by Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York.

in his classes then is generally the case in English classes. And his experiences and preparation in writing should include the more creative as well as expository modes and should help him develop a genuine interest in fostering individual pupil's creativeness. Her emphasis upon the importance of oral communication and creative writing is in keeping with a plea that began at least as long ago as President Eliot, and that has been greatly strengthened by recommendations from Hosic's Joint Committee, Barnes, contributors to *An Experience Curriculum*, and the Dartmouth reports. She also describes in some detail the kind of preparation the teacher should have in the nature of language, the history and structure of the English language, and modern concepts of usage and semantics. Although interest in the importance of semantics seemed to have declined for a number of years, it is again on the rise. The re-awakening of awareness of the importance of semantics in the English curriculum was evident also at Dartmouth. Muller begins his own statement of what he believes might be the basis of a language program in secondary schools with this sentence: "The students should acquire some understanding of the nature of denotations and connotations of words."[57]

Professor Hartley was also in keeping with past and present emphasis upon experience. She stresses the importance of the experiences surrounding the English teacher and pupils studying a subject "closely bound to the experience of living for its interpretation and significance." She had been a member of the Commission that wrote *An Experience Curriculum*. And throughout the rest of her distinguished career, perhaps culminating in her rich contributions to Volume V of the Curriculum Series, *The Education of Teachers of English* (1963), she continued to strive for improved preparation of teachers of English.

ONE study of the preparation of teachers of English near the close of the 1940s apparently introduced some new features into such inquiries. In 1946-47, a subcommittee of the Committee to Study English Curricula in the California Educational System surveyed programs offered by fifteen of the eighteen institutions then accredited to prepare teachers of English for secondary schools.

The Committee inquired about the usual components of programs: general education, teaching major and minor, and professional education. But through its questionnaire supplemented by interviews with faculty and students on eleven of the campuses, it also looked into the question of balance in the preparation in composition, grammar, literature, speech, dramatics, journalism; the proportion of the preparation in general education, major and minor, and professional education; the effectiveness of cooperation between the faculty in English and those in Education; the educational training and teaching experiences of faculty preparing teachers, particularly those teaching methods courses and supervising directed teaching; and whether prospective teachers were getting any experience in working with homogeneous and heterogeneous classes and with small groups within classes, in considering the advantages and disadvantages of various kinds of grouping, and in selecting, organizing, and presenting materials and activities appropriately to accommodate abilities and needs of individual pupils.

The committee found that, contrary to common criticisms of the supposed excessive imbalance of preparation in favor of professional education, about 30 to 40 per cent was devoted to general education, about the same percentage to the teaching major and minor and related subjects, about 13 to 15 per cent to professional education, and the rest to electives. In short, approximately 85 per cent of these five-year programs was devoted to general education and the academic major and minor and related subjects.

In its report, the committee offered recommendations on arrangements for and supervision of directed observations followed by directed teaching, aspects of courses in methods of teaching English in secondary schools, on how the departments of English and Education can strengthen their contributions to the education of teachers, and proposed some questions—perhaps they would be called guidelines today—that might be used as a means of a de-

[57] *The Uses of English*, p. 72.

partment's evaluating aspects of its program.[58] All of these matters and many others were taken up in considerable detail in Volume V of the NCTE Curriculum Series.

Charles Willard and John D. Mees made a different kind of informative study in Illinois of teachers of English and their recommendations for improving programs of teacher education.[59] The teachers recommended such courses as practical instruction in methods of teaching English in secondary schools, including the teaching of reading; supervised teaching; modern English grammar and usage; advanced composition; contemporary literature; literature for adolescents; and foundations of psychology. These recommendations and those emerging from Shirley M. Carriar's study of problems encountered by beginning teachers[60] reinforce the contributions that can be made by a program of teacher education designed somewhat in recognition of the realities of teaching English in public schools.

FROM that period on, many individual statements and proposals and reports prepared by groups appeared and continue to do so. Valuable references to the wealth of publications are the bibliographies prepared annually by the NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English. Professor Autrey Nell Wiley is chairman and editor of the original bibliography and the annual supplements published in *College English*.[61] The preparation of this bibliography is a great service to the profession. Regrettably, it has not been possible to review and incorporate in this brief account many of the references in these bibliographies.

The activities of this Committee involved its members deeply with an aspect of preparing teachers that so far had received only passing attention: the standards of certification. It had been mentioned in the Hosic report in 1917. But it did not get the vigorous attention it deserved until the middle of the 1950s. One early indication of an awareness of its importance and of problems created by the wide variations in standards from the meaningless to the respectable can be found in the report, "The English Language in American Education," written by Thomas Clark Pollock for a special committee of the Modern Language Association's Commission on Trends in Education. It was first published in 1945 and later appeared in *PLMA*, February 1951. Speaking for the special committee about the inadequacy of some states' certification requirements in the 1940s, Pollock reports that:

> Some states require only six semester-hours in college English, some require as many as thirty semester-hours; some require of the prospective English teacher no college hours or courses in English at all. In general, the requirements are inadequate in at least three ways. First, they do not provide adequate *qualitative* standards of selection. . . . Second, the quantitative standards they set up are usually inadequate. The average requirement is much below the minimum for a college major in English. Third, they usually make no distinction between the various kinds of college courses in English.
>
> We therefore recommend that certification requirements for teachers of English include provision for a quality of work high enough to indicate probable mastery of the subject matter studied; quantitative standards, in terms of se-

---

[58] Alfred H. Grommon, "The Training of Teachers of English for the Secondary Schools of California," *The Educational Forum*, 12 (November 1947) 87-102.

[59] "A Study of the Present Teachers of English in Illinois and Their Recommendations for an Improved Program," *Illinois Bulletin*, 41 (May 1954) 8.

[60] *Instructional Problems of Beginning English Teachers in Colorado, 1956-57*, Unpublished Doctor's Field Study, (Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State College, 1958).

[61] Autrey Nell Wiley, ed., *The Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English, A Bibliography* (1950-1956). (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English).

———, "The Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English: 1958 Supplement to *A Bibliography (1950-1956)*," *College English*, 21 (April 1960) pp. 379-383. A supplementary bibliography has been published in *College English* each year since.

> mester-hours or some other index of exposure to learning, high enough to indicate that the prospective teacher has had a fair opportunity to master the subject; and analytical standards which will require, not only that the prospective teacher has had work in a college department of English, but also that he has had the type of study which we have indicated as necessary for a properly qualified teacher of the English language. Whenever possible an examination which tests ability and mastery rather than the amount of time previously spent in learning should be substituted for formal course requirements.[62]

In the middle of the 1950s, Donald R. Tuttle, then Professor of English at Fenn College in Cleveland and now Chief of the English Section in the U.S. Office of Education; Eugene E. Slaughter, Chairman of the Department of English, Southeastern State College, Durand, Oklahoma, and previously Director of Language Institutes Branch, U.S. Office of Education; and John H. Fisher, then Professor of English, Indiana University, and now Executive Secretary of MLA, became disturbed over these variations in standards for the certification of teachers of English. Professor Tuttle worked tirelessly throughout the State of Ohio to win support for his campaign to persuade the state officials to increase certification requirements for teachers of English. Coupled with this problem was and, to some extent, still is the undesirable administrative practice of assigning English classes to teachers unprepared to teach English.[63] Fisher and Slaughter made extensive biennial surveys of all states' requirements for teachers of English. In reports of follow-up surveys, Fisher analyzed discernible trends in requirements. During the period of these surveys, 1954-1960, appreciable increases were made in the number of credits needed for certification to teach English.[64] Although some requirements were still indefensibly low, many states had increased their requirements considerably, and all are far above the weakest Pollock reported in the 1940s. Many states are working with specialists in subject matter and in education to establish reasonable standards for certification.

Further evidence of this growing concern in the last half of the decade can be seen in the 1955 annual meeting of the Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education at which a group discussed what may have seemed like a surprising topic: "The Learned Societies and the Crisis in Teacher Supply and Preparation." Shortly thereafter, the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, generally called TEPS, organized three national conferences involving representatives of about sixty organizations, not only of professional educators and state officials responsible for certification but also of academicians in a wide range of subject-matter fields, including representatives of MLA, NCTE, the College English Association, and the American Council of Learned Societies. At these national meetings, representatives discussed the full range of problems of selecting, preparing, and certifying teachers for public schools. Four reports were published.[65] In a single follow-up volume, *The Education of Teachers,*

---

[62] George Winchester Stone, Jr., ed., *Issues, Problems, & Approaches in the Teaching of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 156-157.

[63] Donald R. Tuttle, "A Professional Teacher of English for Every American Student," *College English,* 19 (November 1958) 87-91. Additional studies of the assignment of teachers of English classes can be found in *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges,* pp. 166-169. For a more recent study in Wisconsin see Ruth E. Falk and Robert C. Pooley, "A Survey of Teachers of English in the State of Wisconsin," *Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English,* Special Bulletin, No. 12, September 1965.

[64] John H. Fisher, "Certification of High School Teachers," *College English,* 22 (January 1961) 271-275. For detailed information about requirements in 1954 and 1957, see Fisher's reports in *College English,* 16 (March 1955) 362-365; and 19 (May 1958) 344-348.

[65] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives; Official Report of the Second Bowling Green Conference.* (Washington: National Education Association, 1958).

———. *The Education of Teachers: Curriculum Programs. Official Report of the Kansas Conference.* (Washington: N.E.A., 1959).

Conflict and Consensus, G. K. Hodenfield, Education Writer for the Associated Press, who reported each of the national conferences, and T. M. Stinnett, Executive Secretary, NCTEPS, who "added only technical materials," reviewed and analyzed the papers, discussions, and reports.[66] Although this report contains little on the preparation of teachers of English, it does convey the purpose of these important conferences conjoining the academicians and educationists and contributed greatly to the movement toward using specialists in academic disciplines as consultants to state departments of education on matters related to the certification of teachers. Two programs for the preparation of teachers of English for secondary schools, however, are reported in some detail: Fenn College, Cleveland, pp. 70-72; and Stanford University, pp. 89-91. These shortened versions are based upon more complete descriptions in *Curriculum Programs,* the report of the Kansas Conference.

One of the cosponsoring organizations for the TEPS Conferences was NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teachers Education and Certification). Perhaps in the course of these conferences involving NASDTEC working together with representatives of such academic fields as mathematics, biology, modern languages, and English may be found the origins of the projects leading to the development of the guidelines for the education and certification of teachers of mathematics, science, modern foreign languages, and now English. During the decade, 1955-1965, a good deal of educational ecumenicism developed among members of college departments of English and other disciplines, state departments of education and their certifying officers, learned and professional societies, departments and schools of education, the U.S. Office of Education, and in some cases—as in English—among the key organizations within the field.

THIS last is exemplified by the Conference on the Basic Issues in the Teaching of English held throughout 1958. Twenty-eight representatives of the American Studies Association, the College English Association, the Modern Language Association, and the NCTE met in three three-day sessions to identify what they considered to be the basic issues in the teaching of English throughout the schools, colleges, and universities. The group identified twenty-one basic issues related to goals, content, and problems of teaching English, and fourteen in the preparation and certification of teachers. The report, *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English,* was published as a supplement to *English Journal,* September 1959.

The following issues in the preparation and certification of teachers for the elementary and secondary schools are identified:

22. How much and what kind of training in English should the elementary school teacher have?
23. What skills should an elementary school teacher have in order to develop eagerness in pupils to learn to read and write well?
24. How much of the teacher's training should be in education courses and how much in courses primarily devoted to language and literature?
25. Ideally, how much college study of language and literature is desirable for the secondary school teacher?
26. What standard qualifications in English can be established for secondary school English teachers?
27. What is the responsibility of liberal arts colleges in the preparation of effective teachers of English?
28. What kind of training in teaching methods does the future secondary school English teacher need?
29. How can the Master of Arts degree be made more effective in the preparation of secondary school teachers?
33. How can we achieve articulation

———. *The Education of Teachers: Certification. Official Report of the San Diego Conference.* (Washington: N.E.A., 1960).

———. *New Horizons for the Teaching Profession.* (Washington: N.E.A., 1961).

[66] (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., A Spectrum Book, 1961).

of teaching and teacher training at all levels in English.[67]

34. How can opportunities be made for continued education and intellectual growth for English teachers on all levels?

The basic issues raised by the conference are not new, of course. As perhaps this review has already shown, many of them have concerned people in this field since at least the beginning of this century. But the crystallization of these persistent problems and the detailed questions and comments delineating each issue by representatives of the key organizations symbolizing the profession of teaching of English—at all educational levels—is of utmost significance. This list serves the profession as a convenient, stimulating inventory of where we are and as an inescapable directive on the business before it.

One direct follow-up of the Conference on the Basic Issues was the publishing of a volume of selections on *Issues, Problems, & Approaches in the Teaching of English*.[68] Part I, "Issues & Problems," includes the report on the Conference. The bulk of the book consists of selections on the major aspects of English that had been published since 1900 as chapters of books, sections of reports, or as separate essays. But of immediate concern here is Part IV, "A Program for Action." It includes "An Articulated English Program: A Hypothesis to Test," which developed out of the discussions of the basic issues. One of the hypotheses to be tested is related to the preparation of teachers of English. This one-page statement, like the more extended discussion of teacher education in *An Experience Curriculum*, is placed at the end of the book.

Some of the specifications are in keeping with recommendations made elsewhere: elementary school teachers should have a minor in English, courses in children's literature which includes myths, folk tales, courses in the teaching of reading and of writing, and an advanced course in writing; secondary teachers should also have an advanced course in writing, much literature, including a study of myth, folklore, fairy tales, Biblical lore, a "sound English major, of the comprehensive type," an M.A. in English, work in literary criticism, literary backgrounds, linguistics, and the teaching of writing."[69]

Of special interest is the emphasis upon all English teachers' having a "thorough knowledge of . . . the process of writing." This emphasis in 1961 is surprising but welcomed. Nothing more is said about just what that "process" is. Since then, however, illuminating, stimulating materials have been developed in the Northwestern University Curriculum Study Center, directed by Wallace W. Douglas. This Center and teachers in the cooperating schools have attempted to identify somewhat specifically what the steps in the process of writing seem to be and what teachers and students can do to shift the focus away from the end product of the writing assignment to the whole process by which one tries to write.

Anyone reading the Report on the Basic Issues Conference and this one-page directive on teacher education might have difficulty reconciling the two documents. Whereas the Basic Issues Report is invested with the spirit of cooperative inquiry and discovery, the statement on teacher education is charged with stern attitudes and harsh language. There is much demanding of thoroughness and of furnishing young minds. There is the chilling statement that some of the teachers' problems "derive from the sterility of their continuing professional and intellectual development." And the piece closes with the condescending suggestion that departments of English in liberal arts colleges help

---

[67] In this section, the Advanced Placement Program is cited as one example that articulation is occurring. For a discussion of some implications the growth of the APP may have for the preparation of teachers of English, see Alfred H. Grommon, "The Advanced Placement Program's Implications for the Preparation of Teachers of English," *College English*, 21 (April 1960) 373-378.

[68] *Op. cit.* Edited by George Winchester Stone, Jr., who, then Executive Secretary of MLA, had been a participant in the Basic Issues Conference, and is now Professor of English, New York University.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

English departments in "teachers colleges" improve their programs. And yet the recommendations are said to have been "drawn from 120 pages of the minutes of the four conferences held on the basic issues."[70]

UNQUESTIONABLY the most important development in this field in 1961 was the publication of the National Council's daring, revealing, influential document, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, A Report on the Status of the Profession, written by a special Committee on National Interest. The report was prepared to fulfill a resolution adopted at the 1960 convention of the Council calling upon the Executive Committee to do all it could to gain support for the teaching of English, to inform the "nation's leaders in government, business, and education" of the neglect of English in "current educational efforts, and, most pressing, to try to persuade the Congress to extend the NDEA of 1958 to include English and the humanities as a vital first step toward improving instruction in English and of stimulating program development in this important area."

The report boldly announces to the public the rather general inadequacy of the preparation of even the English majors teaching English in the schools and that about half of the teachers assigned English classes in secondary schools in 1959-1960 had not completed an English major in college. The details of these findings can be found in the report.

But of special relevance here in tracing the prelude to the ETPS Guidelines is "A Standard of Preparation to Teach English,"[71] developed initially by the NCTE Committee on Preparation and Certification of Teachers. In a sense, this outline is a skeletal precursor to the more detailed Guidelines. The Committee introduces the outline with an overall statement about the teacher's personal qualities, the balanced nature of his general education, "including knowledge of a foreign language and a basic grounding in science, mathematics, the social sciences, and the arts," preparation in psychology and professional education, and his being a person who "has dedicated himself to humanistic values." The outline specifies the kind of preparation in modern English language and its background, the scope of his preparation in English, American, and world literature, the ability to use a variety of modes of critical analysis, and the kinds of abilities he needs as a teacher to use effectively his knowledge of his subject. Though modest in scope, this outline represents an important first step toward the identification of specific standards.

The flatout effort by the Council's leaders to persuade the Congress to include English and the humanities in the extension and revision of the NDEA failed, but not entirely. By this vigorous campaign, the Executive Committee and the Committee on National Interest informed and awakened the profession to its political responsibilities and to its professional responsibilities in facing up to the facts of the status of the teaching of English and of the urgency of improving both preservice and inservice education of persons assigned to teach English classes. And it eventually led to success in 1964, when English was included in the extension of the Act passed by the Congress.

A development beginning in the summer of 1961 also had far-reaching effects. During three weeks of that summer, sixty instructors selected to staff the CEEB Summer Institutes to be held on twenty campuses in 1962, studied, discussed, haggled over, and planned the three courses to be offered to some 900 high school teachers to be chosen to attend the institutes. These professors of English and a few high school teachers invited to teach in some of the institutes were forced through an "agonizing reappraisal" of what they thought should constitute up-to-date, relevant courses in modern English language, advanced writing, and literature to be presented to carefully selected high school teachers instructing students preparing to attend college. The courses in modern English language and advanced writing were selected to help teachers overcome these serious deficiencies in their preparation as revealed in published surveys. It was hoped,

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 235.

[71] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, pp. 40-42.

of course, that the experiences these English professors had in planning these courses and then later teaching them to experienced teachers of English would make some lasting impact upon them as individuals and subsequently upon their departments' programs for future teachers of English.

The next summer, 868 high school English teachers who generally taught college preparatory students attended the twenty institutes, took the three courses, and in accompanying workshops or seminars led by instructors experienced in teaching English in secondary schools had opportunities to discuss the relationship of the courses to their own classes and to prepare materials appropriate to them. This was a form of strenuous inservice education. Two features of the arrangements were especially sound in assisting the teachers to adapt and apply elements of the institutes' programs to their own classes. First, each candidate had to include with his application a letter from his principal stating that if the teacher were selected to attend the institute, he would be free to apply in his own classes what he thought especially relevant from the institute program. Second, a member of each institute staff was expected during the following fall semester to visit the classes of each teacher who had attended the institute. Here was a sensible program providing a two-way education: the teacher and his students had an opportunity to confer with an English specialist from a college or university; the professor had the sobering, firsthand experience of seeing in the classes of some forty-five teachers what it is really like to teach English to high school students. The triple-level experiences of college faculty in preparing and teaching courses for high school instructors and then of actually going into the trenches during the follow-up visits did indeed make lasting impressions upon some English professors.[72] In some college quarters where it was needed, the prestige of the CEEB lent considerable support to existing college courses in modern English language and to efforts to establish them elsewhere. The institutes and follow-up activities helped to articulate English programs in schools and colleges. And they later served as models for many of the initial NDEA English institutes in 1965.

LATE in 1962 another conference occurred that augurs well for future involvement of college departments of English in preparing teachers. In December, chairmen and representatives of eighty departments of English in colleges and universities throughout the country assembled at the University of Illinois center called Allerton Park, in Monticello, Illinois. The conference was called to discuss research in the teaching of English, especially research related to the U. S. Office of Education program known as "Project English." Important though the considerations of research are, of greater significance here is that the seminar led, first, to the adoption of resolutions stating English departments' responsibilities in the preparation of teachers, and, second, to immediate action on the resolution that the chairmen establish organizations of themselves on "state, regional, and national levels."[73] "These resolutions were approved by unanimous or almost unanimous votes" of the some 80 representatives of all kinds of institutions in all parts of the country. Thus the Association of Departments of English was founded.

In their resolutions, the representatives

---

[72] For information about another conference for college faculty in 1962 on the preparation of English teachers, see *The Academic Preparation of Secondary Teachers*, The Reports of Four Committees of the Twenty-nine College Cooperative Plan (Cambridge: Twenty-nine College Cooperative Plan, 1962). The program of undergraduate courses recommended by professors of English representing five liberal arts colleges and two universities is quite in keeping with recent recommendations in the profession. But the proposals for the teaching of literature as a way of overcoming high school students' indifference and ineptitude regarding the reading of literature are poles apart from the concepts and attitudes expressed by Hosic, Barnes, contributors to *An Experience Curriculum*, and the British and American professors of English participating in the Dartmouth Conference.

[73] "Resolutions Adopted at a Seminar of English Department Chairmen," held at Allerton Park, December 2-4, 1962, *College English*, 24 (March 1963) 473-475.

declared that one of the most important responsibilities of English departments in colleges and universities is to provide both preservice and inservice education for teachers of English. They wisely point out that in fulfilling this commitment departments should "regularly review and evaluate their training programs for teaching assistants and their courses designed for the preparation of high school teachers." Departments now have the widely endorsed ETPS Guidelines to help them test the relevance of their program and specific courses for secondary school teachers much more realistically than they could have envisioned in 1962.

They also recommended that English departments make suitable provisions for qualified experienced teachers who return to take English courses. Teachers denied access to English courses relevant to their interests and needs will be forced thereby to elect courses in other departments, mainly in Education. Although such courses as those in guidance, supervision, administration, psychological and social foundations of education are undoubtedly helpful for educators for whom they are intended, they are a poor substitute indeed for the English teacher who needs a course in modern English language, advanced writing, contemporary literature, or poetry.

The chairmen also emphasized in their resolutions the importance of English departments' expanding "their cooperation with elementary and secondary school teachers of English," offering summer institutes and seminars for them, and, through a national association of departments, coordinating their efforts with those of the MLA, the NCTE, the College English Association, the College Language Association, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the American Studies Association. Missing from this list is the Conference on English Education, formed in 1963-64. Had it been in existence in 1962, undoubtedly it, too, would have been included among the professional organizations closely related to purposes of the other groups. In fact, the three or four persons most directly responsible for founding the CEE also participated in the Allerton Park Seminar.

By itself, each of these resolutions and others not mentioned here represents a major advance toward mustering the full resources of all dedicated to the improvement of English instruction. Taken all together, they represent a cohesiveness that should prevent any unfortunate splintering of effort. The cohesiveness is already evident. The close correspondence between some of these resolutions and, on the one hand, the functioning of the CEEB institutes during the preceding year and summer, and, on the other, the Guidelines to be developed three years later should not be surprising. Many of the eighty departmental representatives who drafted the resolutions had helped plan and conduct CEEB institutes and later contributed to the development of the Guidelines.

IN 1963 appeared two especially influential reports: *The Education of American Teachers* by James Bryant Conant[74] and *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges*[75] prepared for the NCTE by the Commission on the English Curriculum as Volume V of the Curriculum Series. Conant, former president of Harvard University, through the vigorous attention he has long been giving to problems of education in this country and overseas, has proved to be a worthy inheritor of the genuine commitment to improving public education exemplified by his illustrious predecessor, Charles William Eliot. Conant and his staff, supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, made a two-year investigation of the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools, including certification requirements and practices. During this broad-gauged study, he and his staff also examined, of course, the preparation of elementary school teachers related to their functions as teachers of English and of teachers of English for secondary schools. Conant based his report substantially upon visits he and his staff made to seventy-seven institutions in twenty-two states.

This probe into the preparation and cer-

---

[74] (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1963).

[75] Alfred H. Grommon, Editor (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1963).

tification of teachers included also an investigation of the "educational establishment" represented, according to Conant, by "organized school administrators, state Department of Education personnel, classroom teachers of various kinds, professors of education, and the executive staffs of such organizations as the School Boards Association and the Parent-Teacher Association."[77] Whereas Fisher and Slaughter were concerned with their investigations into states' quantitative requirements for the certification of teachers of English for secondary schools, Conant inquired also into and analyzed both the educational and political structures of the educational establishment in the several states, the relationships with academic departments in colleges and universities and with the public, and the influence of all this upon the preservice and inservice education of teachers and upon standards and procedures of certification.

This is not the place, however, to analyze and evaluate Conant's many recommendations for altering the educational pattern and certification of teachers. Those of special interest here relate to preparing teachers to teach English. He believes that prospective teachers for elementary and for secondary schools can be adequately prepared in four-year programs.[78]

He takes this stand despite his having been instrumental in establishing at Harvard in 1936 the first M.A.T. program, despite the consistent recommendation by each of the three national TEPS conferences that five years of preparation be required for elementary and secondary school teachers, despite the rapid expansion and development of fifth-year M.A.T. programs nourished by generous funds provided by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, and despite some states' requirements that beginning teachers for secondary schools must first complete a five-year college program. But he does stress the importance of inservice and continuing educational programs and makes excellent, specific recommendations for the kind of "initial probationary period" school boards should provide for new teachers to improve their chances of succeeding as beginners.[79]

He specifies within the four-year program planned for future teachers for elementary schools a substantial two-year, sixty semester-hour program of general education, including a six semester-hour course in the English language and one in the Western world's literary tradition. The rest of the program would consist of a thirty semester-hour concentration in academic subjects and thirty in professional education. He recommends that all students have at least a three-semester-hour course in reading instruction. Those preparing to teach in the kindergarten and the first three grades should have twice this much instruction in the teaching of reading. He offers detailed specifications for these courses. But he also emphasizes the great importance of these students' having at the same time extensive experiences in teaching children to read and in practicing techniques of diagnosis and particularly of remedial teaching.[80]

In his recommendations for preparation in subject-matter fields, Conant distinguishes between the needs of candidates preparing to teach in the lower grades and those preparing for the upper. He believes that those intending to teach in the lower grades should distribute the thirty hours of what would otherwise be a concentration over English, social studies and mathematics, and then some "integrated" courses in the rest of the curriculum in these lower grades. Those preparing to teach in the upper grades should devote the thirty hours to a concentration in English, mathematics, social studies, or science, in addition to related courses in the program of general education. He outlines courses in the teaching of reading and mentions preparation in literature for children. But he does not recommend specifically any courses in

[77] *The Education of American Teachers*, pp. 15-16.

[78] *Ibid.*, pp. 202-3.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 70-72. According to Jeremiah Finch, Professor of English, Princeton University, and a member of Conant's staff during this study, some city school systems have now provided some beginning teachers with the kind of probationary arrangements described by Conant. Some internships in fifth-year programs also provide somewhat similar arrangements.

[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 155-157.

speech, dramatics, oral interpretation of literature, and advanced and creative writing. He does advocate, however, experiences working with and teaching children concurrently with courses in child growth and development, teaching of reading, a series of workshops in the content and methods of teaching subjects in the elementary school curriculum, followed by practice teaching. And he describes the qualifications of the kind of clinical faculty he recommends supervise candidates' laboratory experiences and practice teaching in the schools.[81]

For the teacher preparing for secondary schools, he also recommends a program of general education totaling sixty semester hours. He reckons the extent of the academic concentration, however, not so much in course hours as in competence that can somehow be measured by a comprehensive examination. But he does not specify the nature of that examination. The rationale and some possibilities of such an examination in the field of English, are explored in some detail, though, by Wayne C. Booth in his chapter, "The Undergraduate Program," in Volume IV of the NCTE Curriculum Series, *The College Teaching of English* (1964). Booth believes that a kind of consensus already exists among English departments of what a student majoring in English should know and be able to do by the time he completes the program. He presents some speculative criteria based somewhat upon the aforementioned standards for teachers of English. In a vein similar to Conant's, Booth states that "once we shift from coverage to competence, we can begin to make our way with greater assurance among the various programs and devices that a department might or might not develop."[82] Then he presents a sample "Senior Comprehensible Examination," one that might also serve well the purposes Conant has in mind.

Regarding the concentration in English for prospective teachers, Conant said that:

> One might suppose that an adequate major or concentration in English for the A.B. degree in a college with a liberal arts tradition should be more than enough for the high school teacher. Indeed, such a major may provide enough hours of study, but the level of competency in different areas is another matter. On the advice of highly competent persons in the field, I have been persuaded that a future English teacher should have studied not only British and American literature in some depth but also the structure of the English language, and modern grammar; in addition, he should have given some time to familiarizing himself with adolescent literature, with reading problems, with speech and drama, and to composition at the advanced level. Yet many a major in English in our best colleges and universities may have omitted some of these studies. Indeed, the omission may be quite in order if the graduate is not going to be a high school teacher.
>
> Obviously, what is essential is a close cooperation between professors of English and the clinical professor in charge of the methods course and practice teaching. The same is true in every field and needs no further underlining.[83]

The correspondence between these suggestions and those in the Guidelines is obvious. Similarly, the point about the importance of close cooperation between professors of English and the faculty member responsible for courses in methods of teaching English in secondary schools and for supervising the directed teaching done by future English teachers parallels a resolution adopted in 1962 at the Seminar of English Department Chairmen: "Teachers of English education should hold appointments in English departments whenever possible."

Several of Conant's overall recommendations for the education and certification of teachers for elementary and secondary schools are now being tried out in a few universities and colleges with the cooperation of the certifying agencies in the states in which these institutions are located. Northwestern University, for example, has published a brochure describing its pro-

[81] *Ibid.*, see Chapter 7, "The Education of Elementary School Teachers."

[82] *The College Teaching of English*, p. 206.

[83] Conant, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-173.

gram based upon some of Conant's recommendations. And, as was mentioned earlier, some cities are providing beginning teachers with an initial probationary year based upon his ideas. But his conviction, apparently based upon his conversations with teachers, that a four-year college program is "more than enough for a high school teacher" is certainly not in keeping with the conclusion generally accepted throughout MLA, NCTE, the more than 100 universities offering fifth-year M.A.T. programs, and several states that five years of college preparation should be the minimum for future teachers for the elementary and the secondary schools.

Yet despite the differences within the profession concerning some of Conant's recommendations, the entire profession is indebted to him for the thoughtful, thorough, imaginative attention he has given over the past few years to our junior and senior high schools, to schools in slums and suburbs, and to the education of teachers. In the long run, some of his most radical recommendations may yet prove to be the most worthwhile in nudging the educational enterprise along.

THE *Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* prepared for the NCTE by the Commission on the English Curriculum was also published in 1963. This volume represents by far the most comprehensive study yet attempted of the recruitment and the preservice and inservice education of teachers for the elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools and colleges. Thirty-eight specialists in English, in the teaching of English at all levels of our educational system, and in English education contributed to this report.

They point out that the responsibility for recruiting qualified future teachers of English actually begins with the elementary and secondary schools and the communities they serve, especially in communities having chronic shortages of teachers. In the colleges, the responsibility belongs to the departments of English and education.[84]

The committee of specialists in elementary education, principally Dora V. Smith, Alvina T. Burrows, Ruth G. Strickland, and Mildred A. Dawson, recommends programs for the general education, academic, and professional education of teachers for elementary schools. Their discussion and analysis are more comprehensive than Conant's. As a guide to those planning programs relevant to a teacher's professional responsibilities, the writers first present a detailed analysis of what an elementary school teacher does on a typical day working with children, in teaching reading, literature, writing, speech, and listening. The sample programs selected from among those in colleges and universities throughout the country and the recommendations illustrate how preservice and inservice education contribute to a candidate's liberal education and to his learning how to fulfill his professional responsibilities as a teacher of children.

Because on a typical day in an elementary school class the teacher devotes 40-60 per cent of his time to various aspects of the English language arts, the following requirements are recommended for *all* students preparing to meet the realities of teaching in elementary schools:

> Regardless of the schedule of majors and minors, all elementary school teachers should be required to take in addition to freshman English a course in advanced composition; one in the structure, historical development, and social function of the English language; and two in literature, one covering major writers in American literature and one in English or world masterpieces.
>
> Especially significant, also, for all elementary school teachers are adequate courses in speech (such as Fundamentals of Speech, the Oral Interpretation of Literature, Speech Disorders of Children, or Creative Dramatics), and in Children's Literature and Book Selection.
>
> Students preparing to teach in the elementary school should have enough undergraduate work in one academic area and preferably in two to be eligible later to pursue graduate courses in them.[85]

[84] *The Education of Teachers of English*, pp. 6-8.

[85] *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.

Such requirements would help correct the deficiencies in teachers' preparation resulting from the shamefully low requirements in certification reported in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*.[86] To further ensure the adequacy of the preparation of the beginning teacher, the committee recommended that all candidates for teaching in elementary schools be required to complete a five-year program. But whether the program extends for four or five years, the candidate should acquire throughout his last two or three years of preparation—rather than during a fifth year only—the professional knowledge, understanding, appreciation, and skills appropriate to his contributing to the education of children during their first eight years in public schools. Included also are detailed discussions of courses essential to a program of professional education, a variety of sample programs, and specific recommendations for the content of these courses.

Recommendations for the preparation of teachers of English for secondary schools are also far too comprehensive to be reported here except in general terms. The committees of specialists in the various aspects of English and English education who wrote these chapters recommend preparation intended to be in keeping not only with realities of present-day secondary schools but also with discernible future developments. They urge colleges and universities to establish institution-wide committees on teacher education to help coordinate the full resources of the institution to the preparation of teachers, particularly in furthering productive cooperation between academic departments and departments of education in appointing qualified faculty to work with future teachers, in planning programs and courses, and in recruiting and advising these students. The nature and possibilities of joint appointments are described in some detail in Volume V.[87]

Because no research has yet indicated that a particular program has proved to be significantly better than all others in producing effective teachers of English, the writers offer several examples of existing patterns and then recommend what they consider essential and what seem to be justifiable proportions of emphases: about 40 per cent to general education, about 40 per cent to the teaching major and related courses, and the rest to professional education.

The essentials in a teaching major in English closely resemble those emerging for several years and are now stipulated in the Guidelines: a major of about thirty-six semester hours in preparation in the history of the English language, modern English language, advanced composition, speech, oral interpretation of literature, dramatics, English literature, American literature, world literature, contemporary literature, drama, poetry, fiction, principles and methods of literary criticism, and journalism. Such a program would fill the serious gaps in the preparation of teachers of English in secondary schools as reported in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. The content of many of these courses is discussed in detail in Volume V.

The preparation in professional education is also presented comprehensively. Some special features include the making of a "case for professional education," in recognition of criticisms of elements in the usual programs, recommendations on the purposes and substance of essential courses, and especially detailed descriptions of courses in methods of teaching English, in directed observations, and supervised teaching.[88] Because graduates of even an ideal program, if one ever existed or could be created, are novices when they begin their first full-time teaching, the report also includes extensive discussions and examples of inservice programs and of what colleges and universities might do in making follow-up studies of their graduates.

The many writers contributing to this report strove to make it comprehensive, up-to-date, and forward-looking. But many problems remain. Of these, the authors identified three deserving special attention:

[86] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, pp. 43-49.

[87] *Ibid.*, pp. 318-322.

[88] For an informative article on what colleges can do to improve student teaching see John E. Reedy, "The Role of the College in Improving the Quality of Student Teaching in English," *CEE Newsletter*, Number 9 (May 1967) 3-6.

(1) One of the criticisms of teacher education is that "professional educators have not yet developed an adequate unifying theory [of teacher education]; until such schema are available, the design of alternate programs of teacher education must go begging."[89] Do we have a unifying theory? Is it desirable or possible to develop one? (2) We do not yet have persuasive evidence of what the indispensable elements of an ideal program for preparing teachers of English might be. (3) How will the profession solve the continuing problem of recruiting enough academically talented students for careers in teaching to meet the demands?

ANOTHER major development directly related to the education of teachers of English in elmentary and secondary schools occurred during 1963-64. In the opening chapter of *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (1961), "What Has To Be Done about the National Need to Improve the Teaching of English?" the Committee on National Interest recommends, among other sensible ideas, that conferences be called of "college and university personnel concerned with the education of teachers of English." Among the groups suggested were chairmen of the departments of English. As already pointed out, such an organization was founded the next year. Another group was the specialists in English education. To what extent this suggestion may have been a factor in subsequent developments may not be entirely clear, of course. Furthermore, several persons prominent in English education participated in the Allerton Seminar in 1962. Nevertheless, about this time, some leaders in English education—notably Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University; James R. Squire, then Executive Secretary of the NCTE; J. N. Hook, University of Illinois; Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin; Stanley Kegler, University of Minnesota—decided to call a national meeting of specialists in English education, to be held at Indiana University in March 1963. More than three hundred attended. A similar number attended the second annual meeting held at the University of Illinois in 1964, at which a permanent Conference on English Education was proposed as an organization within the NCTE.[90] Burton was elected the first chairman of the Conference. The organization was officially established at the third annual meeting, held at the University of Kentucky in March 1965. Burton includes in his statement published in the first *Newsletter* the objectives of the Conference as defined in the constitution, the first of which is "to provide an opportunity to discuss the organization and teaching of courses within the realm of English education and the preservice and continuing education of teachers of English." A realistic, forward-looking agenda for the Conference—"Looking Ahead with the CEE—An Important Message from Chairman J. N. Hook and Past Chairman Dwight L. Burton"—was published in the *CEE Newsletter*, Number 6 (October 1966). Some of the papers presented at the annual conferences appear in a follow-up monograph entitled *Selected Addresses*, published by the NCTE. Additional information about the activities of the Conference appears in the *Newsletter* published three or four times a year.

Unfortunately, there is no room here even to mention many of the papers published in *Selected Addresses*. But one should be: James R. Squire's address, "The Impact of New Programs on the Education of Teachers of English," given at the Fourth Conference on English Education in 1966. Squire is concerned lest a statement made in a report published by the Fund for the Advancement of Education be true also in the field of English: that curriculum reform in the U. S. does not affect the education of future teachers enough because people in teacher education tend not to be directly involved with curricular developments in the schools.[91] His purpose in this address was

[89] Elmer R. Smith, ed., *Teacher Education: A Reappraisal* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), pp. 14-15.

[90] Dwight L. Burton, "An Organization About To Be Born," *CEE Newsletter*, Number 1 (February 1965) 2.

[91] *New Trends in English Education, Selected Addresses* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1967), p. 7. This observation seems to apply to the 1930s and 1940s when people in English education apparently did not make the report, *An Experience Curriculum*, a central part of

to call to the attention of specialists in English education the following curricular developments he thought should be incorporated in programs educating teachers for the elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools: (1) A Reconsideration of the Place of Oral English; (2) A New Stress on the Psychology of Learning; (3) A Vigorous Reappraisal of Supervision of Student Teaching; and (4) An Awareness of All Forces Affecting English Education. He closed with this timely exhortation:

> It is not my intent to deprecate the splendid efforts in the many projects described at this conference. I say only that those of us concerned about the future of English teaching must watch carefully all developments in English research and scholarship so that we see both the forest and the trees. Let us not forget the continuing contributions of individuals [such as Northrup Frye, Wayne Booth, Owen Thomas, H. A. Gleason, Jr., Paul Roberts].
>
> Emerging from the projects are new insights which clearly indicate a tremendous potential for strengthening teacher education programs. Whether the potential can be wisely utilized in our schools will depend upon the wisdom, persistence, imagination of those concerned with English education and the teaching of English. As we consider new ideas, let us think not only of what they mean for the schools–but of what they mean for us. What new fields of study? What new programs of self-study? What new advanced research? What new designs in course structure? The potential of the projects can ultimately be realized only if the boldness and excitement of many new English programs are matched by bold new programs in teacher education. The projects are showing us the way. But do we know enough? Do we have the courage to follow?[92]

UNFORTUNATELY, the following developments can be mentioned only enough to place them in the chronological development of the field. Furthermore, recent documents are readily available. Among these is the follow-up report of the NCTE Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*.[93] Volume V contains chapters on follow-up studies and inservice education. But this National Interest publication on continuing education is much more informative on the "State of the Profession, 1964." The Committee presents its comprehensive surveys revealing the inadequacies in preservice and continuing education programs and in the supervision of teachers of English. It reports also its findings on the college preparation of teachers in elementary schools and English teachers in secondary schools, the kinds of courses they tend to take in college, and the kinds of courses, institutes, and conferences experienced teachers recommend and would be interested in attending. The Committee suggests practical improvements in college programs in teacher education, in supervision in schools, cities, and states, and in what districts and institutes might do to help teachers improve their professional competence. It also points out what was then the relationship between the amount of federal money available to teachers in fields other than English and the infinitesimal dribbles available to teachers of English. The report is a rich resource to all those involved with the preparation and continuing education of teachers of English.

It was no mere happenstance that in 1964, the Congress of the U. S. included English and reading among subject-matter

---

the preparation of teachers for elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools. The same question arises currently: To what extent are present and future students being prepared to teach English learning about and using the philosophy, materials, and methods contained in the two books and six monographs emerging from the Dartmouth Conference? The same could be asked about the use of materials developed in the curriculum study centers.

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[93] (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1964).

fields in which institutes would be funded through the extended and revised National Defense Education Act. The tremendous efforts made by officers of the NCTE and closely allied organizations, particularly by James R. Squire and the Committee on National Interest, effectively educated members of the Congress, the public, and even teachers of English on the lamentable state of the profession in many important respects and on the inescapable need for financial support from the federal government to support institutes and other programs to begin as soon as possible to overcome glaring weaknesses, that is, to put into force at once the "Recommendations Concerning the Continuing Education of Teachers."[94]

In a section entitled "A Final Word" closing *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (1961), the Committee states that "Present programs for preparing English teachers must be reassessed and new programs developed to assist many practicing teachers. . . . Research must supply better answers for some of the English teachers' urgent questions." And contributors to Volume V also urged institutions to design and test new programs, courses, and professional experiences for teachers.

One research project in the English Program funded by the U. S. Office of Education is designed to experiment with a variety of programs for preparing teachers of English: The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET). This project began in 1964 and will terminate in 1969. It is centered at the University of Illinois in Urbana, is directed by J. N. Hook, and involves twenty participating colleges and universities throughout the state. Its objectives are the following:

1. To evaluate systematic improvements in programs for preparing teachers in twenty cooperating Illinois colleges and universities.
2. To conduct a number of special studies designed to answer some persistent questions about teacher preparation.
3. To develop a model showing how curricular reforms in English teacher preparation can be effected systematically instead of in the widely prevalent patchwork fashion.[95]

The representatives of the institutions prepared as a working guide a list of "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," which is in this issue of the *Journal* pp. 546-9, and is available at the ISCPET headquarters in Urbana. This list has a special feature: the qualifications are classified into those that represent "minimal" competencies, "good" competencies, and "superior." This preliminary statement was prepared before the ETPS project started in September 1965, but can be used to supplement the Guidelines.

The results of the timely research projects and studies underway in the ISCPET will be awaited with considerable interest by those involved with the improvement of the education of teachers of English and of the teaching of English in secondary schools.

One brief item that appeared in 1964 should be of interest to those concerned with inservice education. James R. Squire and Robert F. Hogan extracted from the then forthcoming report, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*, some findings of special importance to administrators. Their article, "A Five Point Program for Improving the Continuing Education of Teachers of English," was published in *The Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, February 1964. In it, they call to the principals' attention the following "specific areas in

[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-178.

[95] The NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum, *Summary Progress Report of English Curriculum Study and Demonstration Centers* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1966), p. 40. For further information about ISCPET see the reports by Michael F. Shugrue, "New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE," *PMLA*, 81 (September 1966 Preprint) and "The Conclusion of the Initial Phase: The English Program of the USOE," *PMLA*, 82 (September 1967 Preprint); these two reports include a brief description of research projects and special studies being conducted by each cooperating institution.

which administrators may work to provide sound continuing education": "Teachers profit from supervision, consultant help, and departmental leadership: . . . from a library of professional books and teaching aids made easily available in their school; . . . from well planned meetings and workshops devoted to the problems involved in teaching English; . . . from attending state, local, and national meetings devoted to the teaching of English; . . . from well planned courses related to the teaching of their subject." Although each of these suggestions must seem obvious, of course, to specialists in English education, the identification and discussion of each may serve well the administrators seeking help in talking with school boards, teachers of English, and neighboring colleges about practical in-service education.

THE summer of 1965 saw the culmination of the NCTE's relentless campaign from 1958 to 1964 dedicated to persuading the Congress to include English and reading among the subjects eligible for categorical NDEA institutes for experienced teachers of English and reading in elementary and secondary schools. Measured by the needs of about 900,000 teachers in elementary schools and about 100,000 teachers of English in secondary schools, the scope of the English and reading institutes in 1965 may seem modest indeed. But when compared to the almost exclusion of English teachers from the benefits of federal funds for educational programs,[96] the support for institutes for teachers of English and reading seemed like a bonanza grander than a Las Vegas jackpot: $5,500,000 for 105 institutes for teachers of English attended by some 4,800 teachers in the elementary and secondary schools who were taught by more than five hundred college and high school teachers.[97] In part, because of the haste in which proposals for these first institutes had to be prepared after the Congress included English in mid-October, many of the programs offered in the approved institutes were closely patterned after the so-called "tripod" curriculum of the CEEB institutes of 1962. Many of the college teachers who had participated in the CEEB program also prepared proposals for NDEA institutes. But others who had found the CEEB courses too heavy offered institutes built around two subjects, frequently a combination of modern English language and advanced writing, though others offered literary criticism, logic, critical thinking. Some were offered for departmental chairmen, supervisors, and specialists in English education during the summers of 1966 and 1967. In 1967, one six-week institute was held in Austria for American teachers of secondary school English engaged in teaching American students attending Department of Defense Schools and other kinds in Europe extending from Norway to Iran.

A special feature of the institutes in 1965-67 was that each participant had made available to him free a sizable sampling of experimental curricular materials being developed in twenty-five Curriculum Study Demonstration Centers. This windfall was made possible by the USOE when it li-

[96] The Committee on National Interest reports in 1964 in *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* that: "During the first four years of foreign language institute programs under the National Defense Education Act, 10,321 teachers received instruction in 218 modern foreign language institutes and that, during 1962 alone, the National Science Foundation supported 911 institutes for some 40,800 science and mathematics teachers, 90 percent of them from the elementary and secondary schools. . . . During fiscal 1962, also, four federal agencies expended $74,906,000 in direct support to improve the competence of elementary, secondary, and college teachers, yet not one cent of assistance was provided for English and humanities" (pp. 69-70).

[97] Michael F. Shugrue, "National English Projects and Curriculum Change," *The English Curriculum in the Secondary School, The Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Number 318 (April 1967) 97. According to Shugrue, about 5,300 teachers attended the 126 English institutes in 1966 and approximately 3,400 attended the 95 in 1967. For an evaluation of the institutes in 1965 see Donald J. Gray, *The 1965 NDEA Institutes in English*, Report of a Pilot Study To Develop Criteria for Evaluating NDEA Institutes in English (Modern Language Association of America and the National Council of Teachers of English, April 1966).

censed MLA and the NCTE to establish the English Institute Materials Center (EIMC) and provided funds for preparing and distributing copies of the experimental materials. Through the superb efforts of Michael F. Shugrue, Director of EIMC, and his staff these materials were distributed to the far-flung institutes, even to the one in Austria.[98] Thousands of English teachers were thereby brought up-to-date on recent developments and experimentation in the English curriculum. These materials were not then available to the public. But the extent to which these materials were used in the institutes may be quite another matter. Here was a significant opportunity for the faculties of the institutes to guard against being bypassed by curricular reforms, as Squire had warned in his aforementioned address, "The Impact of New Programs on the Education of Teachers of English." For three summers, faculties involved in teacher education had opportunities to incorporate the latest developments into their programs for preparing teachers. But whether institutions have generally built them into their preservice and continuing education of teachers is not clear.

At this point, the future of categorical institutes is precarious. They are said to be guaranteed through 1969. By then, however—and perhaps even before—a new wave of what are thought by "frontier thinkers" to be innovative, bold ventures in remaking nothing less than the whole of American education may be in. Surely, nothing so prosaic as helping English teachers improve their work could possibly be sweeping enough to revolutionize the establishment, or so our visionary new leaders seem to have decided—on their own.

Among the NDEA institutes were those for teachers of disadvantaged or culturally different children and youth. A year or so earlier, the Congress had appropriated funds to support the President's program for the "war on poverty." These and other developments demonstrated the country's belated but growing awareness of the crises in the economic, social, health, and educational aspects of the lives of the culturally different in our cities and of minority groups in other parts of the country. Some of the leaders in the NCTE working in large city school systems and long dedicated to offering the best possible, most relevant education to *all* the children in their communities were among those who participated in the institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged and who took the initiative in marshalling resources of the National Council to join the war on poverty but to do so by attacking first impoverished, misdirected education for the disadvantaged.

IN February, 1965, the Executive Committee of the NCTE decided that the Council and the profession needed information about educational programs in the English language arts then being offered the disadvantaged in many parts of the country. Thereupon the Executive Committee appointed the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged and appointed Richard Corbin and Muriel Crosby Cochairmen. The group achieved the impossible. By November 1965, the Task Force working through its crash program had completed its visits and surveys of 190 programs in 115 districts and agencies in sixty-four cities and towns, including twenty-eight involving the preparation of teachers, and then wrote and published a three hundred page report: *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged.*[99]

In its chapter on teacher education the Task Force discusses the work of the English teachers in schools and institutes and also the preparation to teach English to the disadvantaged offered in twenty-eight programs and ten institutes. It summarized some of its findings as follows:

For many an English teacher a class-

[98] For an account of this procedure and an evaluation of the use of these materials see Michael F. Shugrue *et al.*, *An Evaluation of the Use of English Institute Materials Center Curriculum Materials in NDEA Summer Institutes in English* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1966). See also James D. Barry, "Introduction," and Leo Ruth, "The Uses of EIMC Materials in 1966: Significance for the Future," *The Future of the English Curriculum*, edited by James D. Barry (New York: Modern Language Association, 1967).

[99] (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965), pp. v, 167.

> room of disadvantaged students is a crucible. In it, otherwise insignificant handicaps are starkly revealed. A gap in preparation, a narrow view of man, a limited tolerance for variety in human nature—any of which might pass unnoticed in another setting—not only come to the surface, but virtually guarantee failure. This failure is rooted partly in general education programs that fail to provide a broad view of man, in academic specialization divorced from the demands of the work, in professional training that provides neither the rationale nor the skill needed for teaching disadvantaged children.[100]

As shown earlier, Coulter cautioned in 1912 against academic specialization divorced from the demands of the work of teaching children. The issue of relevance seems eternal.

On the basis of its analysis of the complex of problems and of the programs designed to prepare teachers of English to meet some of these issues and to help the individual human being who is so inadequately summarized by any identifiable difficulties, the Task Force makes several recommendations. Among them is that the person preparing to teach English to disadvantaged students must study cultural anthropology and urban sociology and have practical experiences that will help him understand, among other factors, "the lives and the learning styles of children in depressed areas," "the psychological and sociological roots of prejudice and the problems within and between ethnic groups," and "develop a positive attitude toward serving in programs for disadvantaged students." Through his study of the English language he must learn "about the structure of language, particularly of the English language, and about language learning. 'Language' here refers [to] not only its sounds, word formation, and syntax but also its social, geographical, and historical manifestations. Of particular but not sole importance is the emerging work in social dialectology." Essential also are his learning to teach reading and his reading widely in literature appropriate to these students. It also recommends that teachers not preparing to teach the disadvantaged should be helped to "understand the problems *and* satisfactions of those who do."[101]

A valuable guide to the reading prospective and inservice teachers of the disadvantaged should do is now available to them: *We Build Together*, A Reader's Guide to Negro Life and Literature for Elementary and High School Use, edited by Charlemae Rollins.[102] This timely guide is a classified, annotated bibliography of books by and about Negroes. It also includes an informative introduction written by Charlemae Rollins and Marion Edman on the nature of these books, criteria for selecting them, examples of books judged accordingly, and on the treatment of stereotypes.

In his preface to the Task Force Report, Richard Corbin puts the case for education in the nation's campaign against the corrosive effects of poverty upon the human being:

> Without the skills, the knowledge, the understandings that only training of the mind provides, there can be no durable solutions to the age-old human problems of vocational independence, slum housing, social disjuncture, and intellectual atrophy that are the fated products of poverty. Without literacy and without the experience of literature, the individual is denied the very dignity that makes him human and a contributing member of our free society.[103]

Somewhat at the other end of the social and educational spectrum appeared another report in 1965: *Freedom and Discipline*, Report of the Commission of the College Entrance Examination Board.[104] It represents the Commission's statement on the nature of the English curriculum in the schools, methods of teaching the components of language, composition, and literature, and recommendations on the preparation of teachers of English as a means

---

[100] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-168.

[101] *Ibid.*, pp. 171-181, *passim.*

[102] Committee for 1967 Revision of *We Build Together* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1967).

[103] *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, p. v.

[104] (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965).

of improving the quality of instruction. Its recommendations for the academic and professional preparation reinforce those implied in the Basic Issues Report, the standards of preparation in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, and those stated in Volume V. The recommendations on conditions in the schools most conducive to the effective teaching of English are practicable and highly relevant.

We saw in 1965 the culmination of widely held agreements on what the profession was beginning to believe is adequate preparation of teachers of English for the elementary and secondary schools. The climate was highly favorable for the Advisory Board of the English Teacher Preparation Study to convene in Denver, September 1965, to hold its first meeting and thereby launch the nineteen-month study to develop the Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English. The account of this Study appears elsewhere in this issue of the *English Journal*.

UNDOUBTEDLY, the most significant event in 1966, perhaps in this decade, related to the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools and indirectly to the education of teachers of English was the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English held at Dartmouth College during that summer.[105] The two reports on the conference by John Dixon of England and Herbert Muller from Indiana University have already been mentioned. The NCTE is publishing six monographs written by participants.

Of special pertinence here are the sections in the two reports on teacher education. And yet comments on teacher education are meaningful only in the context of what was said and illustrated about the teacher's point of view and functions as a teacher of English. The point of view presented persuasively throughout the Seminar by the school and college teachers from Great Britain emphasized, first, the importance of t . .eacher's concept of his subject and o. the relationship of it and himself to his students, and, second, the inescapable importance of the individual child's experiences, especially those with language: his striving for some concept of self, his encounters with life in and out of school, his use of language in talking and writing as a means of trying to shape himself and his world, his dramatizing of his experiences, his engagement with life experiences underlying literature as a means of seeing himself and his world more clearly. In short, teachers need "help in realizing the full importance of language in society and in the development of an individual's personality and view of reality."[106]

In his summary of the Dartmouth discussion of the nature of English, Dixon, Senior Lecturer in English at Bretton Hall College of Education, Wakefield, Yorkshire, writes:

> To sum up: language is learnt in operation, not in dummy runs. In English, pupils meet to share their encounters with life, and to do this effectively they move freely between dialogue and monologue—between talk, drama and writing; and literature, by bringing new voices into the classroom, adds to the store of shared experience. Each pupil takes from the store what he can and what he needs. In so doing he learns to use language to build his own representational world and works to make this fit reality as he experiences it. . . . In ordering and composing situations that in some way symbolize life as we know it, we bring order and composure to our inner selves.[107]

This point of view involving the teacher, his subject, and his pupils is refreshing. Illustrations provided by the British are impressive. To many Americans at the Seminar, especially to professors of English, all this came as a life-giving breeze fresh

[105] Twenty-one representatives of schools and colleges in Great Britain, one from Canada, and twenty-five from U.S. schools and colleges met for almost a month. Twenty-one consultants from Great Britain, Canada, and the U.S. joined the Seminar for brief periods.

[106] John Dixon, *Growth through English*, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 13. This concept of the role of language was presented by Fred N. Scott in 1903 and this role of literature was viewed somewhat by Barnes.

off the Irish Sea. And the infusion into Americans' discussions of what English teaching is and of how teachers should be prepared accordingly is welcomed indeed; hopefully, it may prove to be revolutionary.

Yet we should not assume that this basic point of view is entirely new in American education. As has been shown throughout this review, it began to appear at least as early as Eliot, it permeates much of what Barnes said from 1918 on, and it is basic to *An Experience Curriculum*, whose writers advocated that an English curriculum should be based upon types of experiences rather than upon specific titles. But somehow we seem to have lost this vision. The British at Dartmouth rendered the American participants a great service not only in reminding us of the child's presence in our classrooms but also by showing *how* to capitalize upon the individual's world and the collection of worlds represented by any class. Perhaps as indicated in the earlier discussion of the section on teacher education in *An Experience Curriculum* and as Squire warned us about the possibility of teacher educators' allowing ourselves to be bypassed by curricular developments, we have somehow failed to make these points of view, concepts, *practices*, and materials *central* in the lives and education of students preparing to teach English. Not one word of all that *An Experience Curriculum* signifies appears in the detailed descriptions of programs of teacher education presented there. Too much was assumed.

Are we now in danger of assuming too much in our broad-front drive for programs of teacher education heavily stacked in favor of academic knowledge? The knowledge is indispensable, of course. The recommendations in the Guidelines represent well the consensus of the profession. But what may be missing here—again—is explicit recognition of the influence of the attitudes, points of view, spirit, sense of awareness of what is going on in the field of the *instructors* teaching the courses and supervising prospective teachers' professional experiences. Perhaps more than a lineup of courses and experiences is needed. The entire Guidelines are a statement of what the *student* should be and know. What is said about instructors? Here is a major factor those undertaking to implement the Guidelines may wish to attend to.

In his brief discussion of teacher education, Dixon expresses his concern with the relationship between programs and the kinds of attitudes and experiences some British delegates advocate for the teacher and his pupils:

> At present, college and university education in both countries, diverse as the systems are, is creating barriers to the teaching of English as envisaged in this report. Clearly students who intend to teach the subject need wide experience in drama, and particularly improvised drama; continuing experience and encouragement in imaginative writing; and a confident grounding in the purposive talk that arises from group learning in an English workshop.
>
> We seriously doubt whether more than a minority of teachers in training approach English in this way. Instead it often appears that the demand for intellectual rigour is so interpreted that it obscures rather than illuminates the process of using language to gain insight into experience at large. Our first concern therefore is that teachers of English at all levels should have opportunities to enjoy and refresh themselves in their subject, using language in operation for all its central purposes—in imaginative drama, writing and speech, as well as the response to literature. Teachers without this experience—who would never think of writing a poem, flinch at the idea of "acting," and rarely enter into discussion of the profounder human issues in everyday experience—are themselves deprived and are likely in turn to limit the experience of their pupils. On the other hand, we were agreed that, just because language is so vital and pervading a concern, mature men and women can surprise themselves by the imaginative power they suddenly realize they possess, given the right opportunity.[108]

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 107. For an excellent example of an American teacher's engaging his students in meaningful talk about Langston Hughes' poem on playing it cool and in illuminating improvised drama see *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-119.

THUS comes to a close this history of the preparation of teachers of English. It is intended to draw attention to a succession of events, documents, and people; each seems to represent not only a culmination of scattered tendencies but also a gathering of forces for a fresh look ahead. Among the many persons and contributions that might have been considered, the following may have served this dual purpose: the structure and functions of the Committee of Ten and its Report (1892-1894); the professional contributions of Fred N. Scott (1903-1913); the founding of the NCTE in 1911; Hosic's *Report on the Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools* (1917); the work of Walter Barnes (1918-1935); the achievements of the first NCTE Curriculum Commission under the chairmanship of W. Wilbur Hatfield (1929-1940), notably its first report, *An Experience Curriculum* (1935); the appointment of the second Curriculum Commission under the directorship of Dora V. Smith and its five reports (1946-1963); the Conference on Basic Issues (1958); the appearance of *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (1963); the NDEA Institutes for the Advanced Study of English (1965-); and the convening of the Dartmouth Conference (1966) in the midst of the nineteen-month English Teacher Preparation Study (1965-1967) that terminated with the publication of the Guidelines in 1967.

Because of the attention given throughout to the significance of the membership and workings of important committees and commissions, the traditional and distinctive features of the English Teacher Preparation Study should also be noted in this context. The historic gap between the worth of recommendations by earlier groups and the failure in many instances to be implemented by official public bodies is clear throughout the decades. But the origins of the recent projects to develop guidelines for the preparation of teachers of sciences and mathematics (1963), of modern foreign languages (1965), and now of English represent a notable shift in the assumption of responsibility for both initiating the studies and seeing that the endorsed guidelines are actually put to use in state agencies having considerable influence and authority. The credit for taking this initiative belongs to the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) and its Executive Secretary, William P. Viall, who served as Director of the Study.

Also to the credit of NASDTEC is that it did not presume to have the academic and professional expertise to develop by itself guidelines for the preparation of teachers of academic subjects. Therefore, it requested and obtained the co-sponsorship of learned and professional societies in each field; in the present case, MLA and NCTE. These organizations did much more than perfunctorily sponsor the study: they devoted their resources and personnel to supporting the endeavor. The Advisory Board and the Director's staff were comprised of representatives of the three organizations. The associate directors were Michael F. Shugrue, Assistant Secretary for English of MLA, and Eldonna L. Everetts, Assistant Executive Secretary of NCTE. Mr. Shugrue with the able assistance of Mrs. Everetts assumed the enormous responsibility of not only contending with the mountain of paper created by each of the four regional meetings and the national conference but also thoughtfully, patiently sifting out the gems essential to the endlessly evolving drafts of the Guidelines. The combination of the sponsorship and endorsement of the Guidelines by NASDTEC, MLA, and NCTE and of the endorsement of a wide cross section of the profession engaged in the teaching of English at all levels and in preparing teachers of English augurs well for the meaningful influence of the Guidelines upon the education and certification of teachers for elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools.

But what now? Certainly one major shift in the focus of American education must be recognized by the entire profession. In the late 1930s, Dora V. Smith saw, as reported earlier, that many experienced teachers deprived of professional assistance in smaller communities needed the help of the NCTE. She had observed that teachers in the larger cities, however, were already being helped by local and national organizations. But by the 1960s, the entire nation had begun to realize that whatever

problems may still be confronting individual teachers in smaller communities seem almost featherlight weighed against the crushing burdens being borne by whole school systems in large urban centers. The very survival of city public school systems may be the ultimate educational issue confronting the nation as well as the cities. From its inception, the National Council of Teachers of English has been responsive to public as well as educational problems. It is urgent indeed that the Council now draw upon its extensive professional and human resources to carry on the valuable contributions made by the Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged by helping institutions and urban communities recruit and prepare teachers qualified by personal attributes, background, education, and experiences to teach English to disadvantaged youth in urban centers and elsewhere.

The Task Force asked that all teachers understand the problems and satisfactions of those who teach the disadvantaged. It did not unanimously agree, however, upon other aspects of programs for teachers of the disadvantaged that should be required of all teachers of English: "work in urban sociology, in teaching standard English as a second dialect, in the literature and the history of American minority groups." Why shouldn't all teachers of English have such preparation? And shouldn't all students who read American literature in public schools and those who take college and university courses in it know about the contributions American Negro writers have been making to our national culture for at least two hundred years and to have read appropriate selections as literature *per se* but also as important commentary upon certain aspects of our history?

It would seem now that programs designed to prepare teachers of English for our schools—wherever located—be based upon the ETPS Guidelines, to be sure. But to make certain the gap between them and the realities of teaching now and in the foreseeable future is as narrow as possible, institutions should supplement the Guidelines with such resources as the following. *Ends and Issues: 1965-1966,* a publication of the NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum provides a good base for identifying some of the realities of teaching English in the public schools today. The materials developed in the Curriculum Study Centers should be evaluated and built into the programs of preservice and continuing education. The information and recommendations in the Task Force's report, *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged,* should be capitalized upon. The two reports on the Dartmouth Conference and the supplementary monographs soon to appear ought to be studied. To these should be added James R. Squire's report on visits to forty-two schools in Great Britain. Soon after 1969 the profession will have the benefit of the results emerging from the experiments and studies being conducted by each of the twenty institutions cooperating in the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers.

It may be some time, however, before the next major projects are launched. But history warns us that we are probably already overlooking in what is now going on around us clues to significant future developments in the teaching of English and in the education of teachers. We must beware lest we neglect the work of individuals, say, of a Charles W. Eliot, a Fred N. Scott, a James F. Hosic, Walter Barnes, W. Wilbur Hatfield, Dora V. Smith, John Dixon, James Britton, David Holbrook, J. N. Hook, Paul Olson, James Moffett, Herbert Kohl, or a James R. Squire. . . .

The History of ETPS

Michael F. Shugrue

Assistant Secretary for English
Modern Language Association
Associate Director, ETPS

WHEN the eighteen members of the Staff and Advisory Board of the English Teacher Preparation Study met for the first time in Denver on September 13, 1965, they were fully aware of the magnitude and importance of the task they were undertaking. Previous NASDTEC studies in science and mathematics and in the modern foreign languages had demonstrated that effective Guidelines for the preparation of teachers could influence the certification policies of the states and teacher preparation programs in colleges and universities throughout the United States. The NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English, led by Eugene Slaughter, Donald Tuttle, and Autrey Nell Wiley, had long urged that a national study build upon previous recommendations and the expertise of scholars and teachers to produce guidelines which could improve teacher preparation in English in the United States at all levels. Now, with a grant of $172,214 from the Cooperative Research Program of the U.S. Office of Education to Western Michigan University, NASDTEC, MLA, and NCTE could begin such a study under the direction of William P. Viall, Executive Secretary of NASDTEC.

At its first meeting the Advisory Board made three important decisions about the directions the Guidelines should take over the next twenty months. It concluded, first of all, that the document should discuss "the teacher of English at any level" rather than isolating the preparation in English of the elementary school teacher from that of the secondary school teacher of English. It agreed, further, that the Guidelines should be stated in terms of teacher competencies rather than in numbers of hours or lists of courses. Finally, it decided that the Guidelines should emerge from a series of drafts presented for discussion, review, and revision to as many organizations, associations, and individuals as the Board could reach between September 1965 and March 1967.

Between October 1, 1965 and April 20, 1967, twenty drafts of the Guidelines were presented to thirteen association meetings, ten state meetings, four regional conferences, and a national conference, in twenty states and in Washington, D.C. Preliminary drafts printed in the *Bulletin* of the Association of Departments of English (November 1966), the *Newsletter* of the Conference on English Education (November 1966), and the *Round Table* (March 1967) invited more than 4,000 teachers to review and comment upon the document. In the summer of 1967, the newly-printed Guidelines were distributed to 6,000 instructors and participants in NDEA Summer Institutes in English, Reading, Disadvantaged

Youth, and English as a Foreign Language. In September and October 1967, through *PMLA*, *Elementary English*, the *English Journal*, and *College English*, the Guidelines reached the 125,000 members and subscribers of the NCTE and the 30,000 members and subscribers of the MLA. In October 1967 alone, more than 1,200 copies were distributed as the result of a state meeting held at Asilomar in California on September 29-30. The development of the ETPS Guidelines is a story worth following.

During the Anglo-American Conference on the Teaching and Learning of English at Dartmouth College in August-September 1966, Nelson Francis of Brown University wryly called the ETPS "the oldest, continuing, floating conference in America." The process by which the Guidelines was revised and polished became, in fact, as important a way of making the educational community aware of the need for reform in teacher preparation programs as the document itself. Continuing discussion, questioning, and revision demonstrated both a keen interest and a growing awareness of the need for improvement on the part of educational leaders from many disciplines in every part of the country. That college English teachers should discuss the content and implementation of the Guidelines at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association in 1965 and at the South Central MLA, the South Atlantic MLA, the Midwest MLA, and the Rocky Mountain MLA was essential. That school teachers and those who supervise teachers should discuss them at the national meeting of the NCTE in Boston in 1965 and again in Houston in 1966 as well as in affiliate meetings throughout the country was equally necessary. Representatives from other groups, too, reviewed the Guidelines and offered suggestions for improving them: the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association for Childhood Education International, the Associated Organizations of Teacher Education, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the College Conference on Composition and Communication, the Conference on English Education, the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, the International Reading Association, NASDTEC itself, and the Speech Association of America. Members of these associations met with state school officers, teachers, and members of the ETPS Staff in ten states to consider how the Guidelines could improve current certification policies: California, Florida, Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Washington. To make the document truly representative, persons from all levels and sectors of public education and from every state in the Union were invited to take part in the continuing dialogue. To test the practicality of the Guidelines for colleges and universities, AACTE selected 100 institutions to examine the document in 1966 and to prepare written evaluations of the Guidelines for the use of the ETPS Board. Someone closely identified with the Study —usually a member of the staff—worked with each of these groups to outline the nature of the study and to record suggestions and revisions. William P. Viall, Director, Eldonna Everttts and Michael Shugrue, Associate Directors, traveled more than 50,000 miles each in the course of the study to explain its background, to take part in discussions, to analyze the revisions and recommendations which came from each meeting, and then to draft the document again.

In preparation for the Northeast Regional Conference, held in Boston on November 28-29, 1965, the Staff drafted Guidelines based on recommendations published by the NCTE, the Commission on English, and ISCPET, and reviewed by the Board in Denver. After revisions by the Board members, the draft was studied by twenty-seven chairmen of departments of English at the South Central MLA on November 4, 1965. A further revision, draft number three, was ready on November 15 for the Northeast Regional Conference. Sixty-three scholars and teachers debated issues and rewrote sections of the draft for two days; the Staff then revised the document again before mailing copies to the eighty-four persons who took part in the Western Regional Conference in Salt Lake City on January 9-11, 1966. As a result of a series of conferences with organizations and state groups, six more revisions preceded the

Midwest Regional Conference, held in connection with the Midwest MLA at Iowa City on April 30–May 2, 1966. At that meeting sixty-one persons radically revised the document. Basic issues such as the nature of the composing process and the responsibility of the English teacher in reading were hotly debated. The Advisory Board met early in June to consider the hundreds of recommendations and rewritings which had been submitted to the Staff during the first year of the study. Draft twelve emerged from that conference. The Staff continued to polish the document over the summer months until draft sixteen, approved by the Board, was sent on October 26, 1966 to the seventy persons who participated in the Southern Regional Conference, held in Charlotte, North Carolina, on November 13-14, 1966, in connection with the meeting of the South Atlantic MLA. Although draft seventeen did not reach members of the Board until Christmas Eve, it contained an urgent request from the Staff to read the Guidelines, comment upon, revise, and return them before the first of the year. Draft eighteen, a tribute to the dedication of the Advisory Board, was mailed to the 132 persons invited to attend the three-day national conference in Chicago on January 26-28, 1967.

The weather intervened. When the snow began to fall during the night, no Chicagoan thought that Thursday, January 26, 1967, would be a day to remember. Even the weatherman had predicted only a snowy, blustery, winter day typical of Chicago in January. That morning, teachers and scholars across the United States packed their bags, studied the final draft of the Guidelines, and prepared to travel to Chicago. Thirty-five NASDTEC members, in session for a meeting of their own prior to the national ETPS conference, noticed at noon that the snow was coming down harder and wondered if the snarl of traffic on State Street was a sign that late trains and planes would delay those coming to the three-day discussion session on the Guidelines. By late afternoon it was apparent that Chicago was in the grips of a blizzard unparalleled in the modern history of the city. Despite twenty-six inches of snow, seventy-nine persons began their deliberations on Friday morning. Some, who had come by train or bus, were delayed for many hours. James R. Squire, Chairman of the ETPS Advisory Board, boarded a bus in Detroit on Wednesday night, became trapped in the snow drifts near Gary, Indiana, and did not reach Chicago until Saturday morning.

Despite the harassments of the weather, the ETPS national conference successfully refined the document, bringing it close to final shape. At the end of the Saturday session, NASDTEC members retired to consider the Guidelines; their endorsement came quickly, subject only to the final editorial revisions suggested by the national conference. By late March, after the Board had discussed draft nineteen, the Guidelines were finished and had been officially endorsed by the Executive Committee of NCTE and the Executive Council of MLA.

The history of the project has, then, a happy ending. That happy conclusion is, however, really only the beginning. The Guidelines must now stimulate discussion and provoke action throughout the United States to strengthen teacher preparation programs in English.

III *English Teacher Preparation Study:*

Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English—1968

Director

William P. Viall

Coordinator of Graduate Programs
School of Education
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Executive Secretary
National Association of State Directors
of Teacher Education and Certification

Associate Director
Eldonna L. Evertts
Assistant Executive Secretary
National Council of Teachers
of English
508 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Associate Director
Michael F. Shugrue
Assistant Secretary for English
Modern Language Association
4 Washington Place
New York, New York 10003

Advisory Board

James R. Squire (Chairman)
Executive Secretary
National Council of Teachers of
English

Charlotte K. Brooks
Supervising Director of English
Washington, D. C., Public Schools

Alvina T. Burrows
Professor of Education
School of Education
New York University

A. B. Cooper, Director
Teacher Education and Certification
State Department of Education,
Tennessee

John H. Fisher
Executive Secretary
Modern Language Association

J. P. Freeman, Director
Division of Professional Services
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

Paul Greene, Director
Teacher Education and Certification
Jefferson City, Missouri

Alfred H. Grommon
Professor of Education and English
Stanford University

Albert H. Marckwardt
Professor of English and Linguistics
Princeton University

Virginia M. Reid, Supervisor
Elementary School Education
Oakland Public Schools
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, California

William P. Robinson, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Providence, Rhode Island

Robert W. Rogers, Dean
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Illinois, Urbana

Otto G. Ruff, Director
Teacher Education and Certification
State Department of Education
Denver, Colorado

Willis H. Umberger, Chief
Bureau of Federal-State-Local Relations
State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut

N. Blaine Winters, Director
Teacher Personnel and Certification
Department of Public Instruction
Salt Lake City, Utah

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

THESE guidelines for the preparation of teachers of English in the secondary schools and for that portion of the preparation of elementary teachers related to the teaching of English emerged from the English Teacher Preparation Study, a project conducted jointly by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the Modern Language Association of America (MLA), with the cooperation of Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo. The Study was supported by a grant from the United States Office of Education. The Guidelines were prepared between September 1965, and March 1967, through a series of four regional conferences and a national meeting, as well as through consultations and conferences with interested agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals. Throughout the Study, successive drafts of the Guidelines were widely distributed for evaluation to those who attended these meetings and to others who were invited to react to them. From the beginning, classroom teachers, professors of English and of Education, deans of instruction, and state school officers helped identify critical issues in the preparation of teachers of English, and helped draft and refine these recommendations.

The Guidelines are intended to suggest desirable competencies for teachers of English. They should help State Departments of Education evaluate a) programs for the preparation of teachers offered by institutions seeking accreditation and b) individual applicants for certification. The Guidelines should also help colleges and universities develop and evaluate programs which prepare teachers for elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools and should encourage institutions to select and recruit good teachers for the teaching profession.

These Guidelines should not be applied arbitrarily in the certification process. They are intended, rather, to set a context within which programs for the preparation of teachers of English can be evaluated with discretion and imagination. They should be used to encourage a college or university to experiment judiciously with curriculums which give promise of improving the teaching of English. They reinforce the responsibility of departments of English to participate actively in the development of teacher preparation programs and suggest that departments of English and of Education, working together, will need to design new courses and new course arrangements for the preparation in English of teachers for elementary and secondary schools.

These recommendations for the preparation and certification of teachers of English focus upon personal qualifications, skills, and kinds of knowledge which contribute to effective teaching: the teacher's personality and general education; his skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing; and his knowledge about and ability to teach language, literature, and composition. The document uses the divisions of English into language, literature, and composition to describe the various responsibilities of the English teacher, but emphasizes that, while it encompasses many areas of study and practice, English is herein conceived of as a unified discipline. Anyone studying and using these Guidelines must recognize the importance of this conception.

Although English studies in American colleges and universities have emphasized chiefly the reading and appreciation of literature, the preparation of the elementary school teacher and of the secondary school teacher of English must include work in the English language, in composition, and in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, both to extend the teacher's own background and to prepare him to meet the full range of his obligations as a teacher of English.

By language is meant the structure and historical development of present-day English. By literature is meant chiefly British and American writing of distinction, but also any other writing of distinction in English or in English translation. By children's literature or literature for adolescents is meant literature which has particular interest and value for children or adolescents. By composition is meant oral and written composition and the relations of these two modes to rhetorical theory.

The phrase, "the teacher of English at any level," refers not only to the secondary school teacher of English, a specialist in English, but also to the elementary school teacher, who, despite his many other professional obligations, spends some 40 to 60 per cent of his time teaching English and related skills. The Guidelines identify basic areas of study for the teacher of English at any level and suggest preparation relevant to the special needs of any elementary or secondary school teacher. However, teachers interested in working with, or assigned to work with, preschool children, junior high school youngsters, students who are disadvantaged, or those learning English as a second language must supplement the basic preparation outlined herein.

Two basic assumptions underlie these recommendations: first, to teach the content of his subject effectively, the teacher not only must know the varied subject matter of English but also must understand how to communicate his knowledge and appreciation to his students; second, his preparation for teaching English should be based upon and supplemented by a background in the liberal arts and sciences, including psychology.

The Guidelines are intended not to suggest the efficacy of one kind of classroom or school organization over another, but rather to emphasize the importance to the teacher of preparation in his subject and in related fields.

The Guidelines attempt to identify and emphasize the competence that should be developed by a satisfactory program of English teacher preparation. They do not identify in any detail, however, specific courses which might exist within a program or the arrangement of such courses, nor do they attempt to prescribe the specific number of credit hours in English required for adequate preparation. It was the consensus of those participating in the conferences, however, that at least fifteen semester hours (or equivalent) in English above the level of freshman English would be required for the adequate preparation of the elementary classroom teacher and that at least thirty-six semester hours (or equivalent) above the level of freshman English would be required for the adequate preparation of the secondary school teacher of English.

The Guidelines do not imply that every beginning teacher will have a mastery of all the knowledge and skills described, but do identify areas in which the beginning teacher must have studied and also suggest the direction—as well as the diversity and the depth—of further study. Not all of the work outlined herein must be taken during four undergraduate years of college; some students will bring strong secondary backgrounds to college; others will need to complete a fifth year of study before they enter the classroom. The beginning teacher of English at any level has a special responsibility to be well qualified because he is a member of his profession from the moment he begins to teach. He must have special training in English and he must have a real understanding and awareness of students, their needs and interests, and the world in which they live. Although the teacher of English incorporates journalism, dramatics, speech, and the teaching of reading skills into his teaching of English, he is not a specialist in these areas.

These Guidelines are indebted, in part, to recommendations on the preparation of teachers recorded in *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (NCTE, 1963), *Freedom and Discipline in English* (Commission on English, CEEB, 1964), and many studies listed in the continuing bibliography on certification reported each spring by the NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English.

Two studies served as immediate precedents for this project. The first, completed in 1963, established guidelines for preparing teachers of science and mathematics; it was conducted by NASDTEC and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The second, completed in 1965, produced guidelines for the preparation of teachers of modern foreign languages and was conducted by the MLA and NASDTEC. Both studies were supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

GUIDELINES FOR ENGLISH TEACHER PREPARATION

I. The teacher of English at any level should have personal qualities which will contribute to his success as a classroom teacher and should have a broad background in the liberal arts and sciences.

II. A. The program in English for the elementary school teacher should provide a balanced study of language, literature, and composition above the level of freshman English. In addition, the program should require supervised teaching and English or language arts methods, including the teaching of reading, and it should provide for a fifth year of study.

B. The program in English for the secondary school teacher of English should constitute a major so arranged as to provide a balanced study of language, literature, and composition above the level of freshman English. In addition, the program should require supervised teaching and English methods, including the teaching of reading at the secondary level, and it should provide for a fifth year of study, largely in graduate courses in English and in English Education.

C. The teacher of English at any level should consider growth in his profession as a continuing process.

III. The teacher of English at any level should have an understanding and appreciation of a wide body of literature.

IV. The teacher of English at any level should have skill in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and an understanding of the nature of language and of rhetoric.

V. The teacher of English at any level should have an understanding of the relationship of child and adolescent development to the teaching of English.

VI. The teacher of English at any level should have studied methods of teaching English and have had supervised teaching.

GUIDELINE I

The teacher of English at any level should have personal qualities which will contribute to his success as a classroom teacher and should have a broad background in the liberal arts and sciences.

A. Like all other teachers, he should be able to work successfully with children or adolescents and with his peers. He should have a mature personality and possess such important qualities as creativity, a sense of humor, self-discipline, and a genuine appreciation of the variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds of his students.

B. He should be an educated person who has a critical awareness of himself and of the world in which he lives. Careful counseling should help him plan a balanced program from among the many disciplines which can contribute to his intellectual growth and to his effectiveness as a teacher of English.

1. History, speech, fine and applied arts, and foreign language would be particularly appropriate in a program for the teacher of English at any level.

(a) Because American literature is an integral part of the curriculum in the secondary school, the teacher of English would benefit from a study of American social, cultural, and intellectual history, as well as political history. The inclusion of the works of many British authors in the curriculums of American elementary and secondary schools suggests the value of the study of British cultural history. The increasing appearance of African, Asian, and Latin American literature in the curriculum makes courses in the cultural history of nonEnglish speaking peoples useful for all, and essential for some, teachers.

(b) Preparation in speech should help the prospective teacher listen more critically, speak and read aloud more effectively, and assist students in developing these proficiencies. Such preparation should also broaden the teacher's knowledge of the processes of oral communication, help him relate these

processes at both theoretical and functional levels to other uses of the English language, and provide him with the means of assessing the effectiveness of his own use of spoken language in varying teaching situations.

(c) Study and practice in the fine and applied arts, valuable in themselves, would enhance the teacher's ability to recognize, to nourish, and to evaluate students' creative work and artistic techniques.

(d) A knowledge of at least one foreign language should not only broaden the cultural background of the secondary school teacher, but also supplement his knowledge of the English language and of literature written in English. Instead of merely reading or hearing about the difficulties and deficiencies of translations and about the differences between the structure of English and that of other languages, he should learn about these matters directly through study of another language, classical or modern. Especially appropriate is the study of a foreign language having a literature that has significantly influenced English and American literature. But in the present world, important advantages accrue from a practical command of any living foreign language.

The increasing frequency and intensity of problems of bilingualism and multi-dialectalism in American schools make it virtually imperative that both the elementary school teacher and the secondary school teacher of English be familiar with a foreign language, with the methods by which English is taught to speakers of another language or dialect, and with the psychological processes involved in learning a second language or dialect.

2. Philosophy, history, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and geography, valuable in themselves, would help the prospective teacher become familiar with a growing body of information that contributes to our understanding of man, his languages, and his literature.
3. The sciences and mathematics would give the prospective teacher some knowledge of these subjects, an understanding of their importance in the modern world, and an introduction to methods of scientific analysis.

GUIDELINE II

A. The program in English for the elementary school teacher should provide a balanced study of language, literature, and composition above the level of freshman English. In addition, the program should require supervised teaching and English or language arts methods, including the teaching of reading, and it should provide for a fifth year of study.

1. The elementary school teacher spends between 40 and 60 per cent of his time teaching English and related skills in almost any pattern of school organization.
   (a) His preparation program should, therefore, develop his own skills and increase his knowledge of the components of English.
   (b) His program must, in addition, include study of materials and methods for teaching English to elementary school children.
2. The fifth-year program may be taken either prior to teaching, during summers, or through accredited extension or inservice courses taken during the school year, but it should ordinarily be completed within the first five years of teaching. The elementary school teacher should study English and English Education to supplement his basic preparation. His needs, deficiencies, or special interests, determined through careful counseling, may suggest undergraduate or graduate work in these or other areas.

B. The program in English for the secondary school teacher of English should constitute a major so arranged as to provide a balanced study of language, literature and composition above the level of freshman English. In addition, the program should require supervised teaching and English methods, including the teaching of reading

at the secondary level, and it should provide for a fifth year of study, largely in graduate courses in English and in English Education.

1. The secondary school teacher of English is a specialist in English:
   (a) His preparation program should, therefore, develop his own skills and increase his knowledge of the components of English.
   (b) His program must, in addition, include study of materials and methods for teaching English at the secondary level.
2. The fifth-year program may be taken either prior to teaching, during summers, or through accredited extension or inservice courses taken during the school year, but it should ordinarily be completed within the first five years of teaching. The secondary school teacher of English should ordinarily study English and English Education at the graduate level. His needs, deficiencies, or special interests, determined through careful counseling, may, however, call for undergraduate or graduate studies in these or other areas.

C. The teacher of English at any level should consider growth in his profession as a continuing process.

1. He should broaden his knowledge and understanding of the content and teaching of English through reading, observation, research, formal course work, inservice study, workshops and institutes, and travel.
2. He should read publications which report investigations of the organization and content of the English curriculum, describe new and improved methods and materials for the teaching of English, report relevant research, and examine the philosophical bases for the teaching of English.
3. He should seek further professional growth through such activities as membership in local, state, and national professional organizations, study in the United States and in foreign countries, and experience as an exchange teacher.

GUIDELINE III

The teacher of English at any level should have an understanding and appreciation of a wide body of literature.

A. His undergraduate program should have prepared him to read for his own enjoyment, to gain insight into himself and the world around him, and to understand and appreciate how writers order experience.
   1. He should have developed a strong commitment to literature as an experience to be enjoyed both in and out of school classes.
   2. He should have developed the habit of reading beyond classroom necessity so that he can bring to his teaching a wide experience with literature and with the means of stimulating his students' creative responses and reactions to literary works.

B. He should have studied literature systematically.
   1. He should know a wide range of significant works of literature recognized as classic and, in addition, examples of other well-written discourse.
   2. He should have studied such major literary genres as drama, poetry, fiction, and the essay.
   3. He should be able to relate contemporary writing to the traditions from which it grows.
   4. He should have studied important writers and writings of English and American literature both to extend his knowledge of literary history and convention and to develop his critical skill.
   5. He should have studied some representative works from literatures other than English and American.
   6. He should have studied in depth some major authors (such as Shakespeare) and at least one literary period.

C. He should have acquired critical and scholarly tools.
   1. He should be able to use his knowledge of language and rhetoric to analyze literature more perceptively.
   2. His study of different ways of analyzing a work of literature should include some formal training in the theories of literary criticism and practice in close textual criticism.
   3. He should be able to analyze and discuss language as it is used in various media and literature as it is presented in such media as radio, television, motion pictures, and theater.

D. He should know literary works appropriate for the level at which he teaches.
   1. The elementary school teacher should know a wide body of children's literature.
   2. The secondary school teacher of English should know a wide body of literature of adolescents.

E. He should have studied and practiced the strategies of teaching literature to students who have a wide range and variety of individual and group differences.
   1. He should be able to foster in his students a taste for literature.
   2. He should be able to demonstrate processes of literary analysis to his students through critical techniques appropriate to the literary work and to the level at which he is teaching.
   3. He should have a knowledge of the theories and methods of teaching children and adolescents to read literature with skill and perception.
   4. He should be able to insure a fuller understanding of literature through his own oral reading and through classroom activities such as individual oral interpretation, choral reading, and appropriate dramatic activities of all kinds.

GUIDELINE IV

The teacher of English at any level should have skill in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and an understanding of the nature of language and of rhetoric.

A. He should have developed skill in speaking and writing.
   1. He should have had supervised practice in speaking and writing in a variety of modes.
   2. He should have acquired a functional understanding of the activities essential to the composing process, and of the qualities and properties of children's writing.
   3. He should have had supervised practice in describing, analyzing, and evaluating, for purposes of teaching, various kinds of speaking and writing, both historical and contemporary.
   4. He should have had special work appropriate to the level at which he will teach:
      (a) to develop his skill in reading aloud and in storytelling;
      (b) to develop his ability to help students control and expand their linguistic resources for conversation and other forms of oral discourse, such as storytelling, informal or structured discussions and reports, or fully developed speeches for public occasions;
      (c) to develop his ability to help students find adequate means of expression in both imaginative and factual writing;
      (d) to increase his awareness of the origins, the objectives, and the potentialities of composition teaching in the schools;
      (e) to prepare him to teach spelling, handwriting, and other conventions of written expression.
   5. He should have had instruction in writing beyond the college freshman level, either through an advanced course in composition or through supervised individual instruction and practice.

B. Not only should he be prepared in the technical and expository aspects of composition, but he should also have explored the creative and liberating functions of

speaking and writing and the relations between such creativity and other forms of expression, e.g., painting and pantomime.

C. He should have a well-balanced descriptive and historical knowledge of the English language.
   1. He should have some understanding of phonology, morphology, and syntax; the sources and development of the English vocabulary; semantics; and social, regional, and functional varieties of English usage.
   2. He should be acquainted with methods of preparation and uses of dictionaries and grammars.
   3. He should be well-grounded in one grammatical system and have a working acquaintance with at least one other system.
   4. He should have studied basic principles of language learning in order to apply his knowledge at various grade levels to the problems of those learning to speak, listen, read, and write to a variety of audiences.
   5. He should have an understanding of the respective domains of linguistics and rhetoric, and of the range of choice available within the structure of the language.

D. He should be able to utilize his knowledge of language and of language learning to develop his own and his students' ability to read and to listen. His knowledge should include an understanding of the components of reading and listening processes and of the variety of ways in which people read and listen.

E. He should have acquired a functional understanding of the nature and substance of rhetoric.
   1. He should have some acquaintance with the principles of classical rhetoric, and should understand their relationship to modern rhetorics.
   2. He should have some acquaintance with the influence of rhetorical theory on the teaching of composition.
   3. He should have sufficient acquaintance with the principles of rhetoric and the nature of the writing process to be able to use the former, where relevant, in analyzing the latter or products thereof, whether written or oral.
   4. He should have sufficient acquaintance with the principles of rhetoric, as related to the writing process, to be able to use them, where relevant in his own writing and speaking, and also in his teaching.

GUIDELINE V

The teacher of English at any level should have an understanding of the relationship of child and adolescent development to the teaching of English.

A. He should in a formal way have studied human behavior, with emphasis upon the age level at which he plans to teach, and should explore relevant research on child and adolescent development for its possible implications for the curriculum in English.
   1. He should have studied the language development of children and adolescents: their interest in language, their growth in using vocabulary and syntax, in understanding and using figurative speech, as well as their growth in the ability to distinguish among several varieties of usage.
   2. He should be aware of the growing knowledge about the relationships between language development and personal development.
   3. He should be aware of the growing knowledge about the specific relationships between control of spoken language (sentence patterns, vocabulary, dialect) and success in reading.
   4. He should recognize aspects of child development that will help the teacher select literature which children or adolescents are likely to understand and enjoy.

B. Because he must constantly evaluate the performance of his students and the effectiveness of his own teaching, both subjectively and by diagnosing and measuring student performance, he should understand the techniques, possibilities, and limitations of testing and of grouping students by interest, aptitude, achievement, and task.

C. He should be familiar with theories of reading and be able to apply appropriate methods to improve the reading abilities of students at various levels of achievement and with various rates of progress.

1. The elementary school teacher should have an understanding of developmental reading from early childhood to adolescence and be able to utilize that understanding in his teaching.
2. The secondary school teacher of English should have an understanding of developmental reading, particularly at the junior and senior high school levels, and be able to utilize that understanding in his teaching.

GUIDELINE VI

The teacher of English at any level should have studied methods of teaching English and have had supervised teaching.

A. He should have considered and analyzed the purposes of English instruction in the schools.

B. The elementary school teacher should have had supervised teaching or an internship which includes the language arts guided by teachers and supervisors prepared in this area, should be able to relate the language arts to other elements in the curriculum, and should be aware of recent developments in the teaching of English.

C. The secondary school teacher of English should have had supervised teaching or an internship at the level at which he plans to teach. He should be guided by a supervisor who has successfully taught English at that level and is aware of recent developments in the teaching of English.

D. He should have learned to use in his teaching what he knows about children, adolescents, and the psychology of learning.

E. He should have learned to analyze units of instruction, to prepare individual lessons and teaching materials, and to understand and evaluate the development and design of courses of study.

F. He should know how to create or find, evaluate, and use significant instructional materials from various media: texts of all kinds, films, kinescopes, tapes, records, slides, and programmed materials.

G. He should know how to select, adapt, and develop activities and materials appropriate to different age groups distinguished by maturity, culture, ability, and achievement, and to individual students.

H. He should have learned how to recognize students who have the kinds of differences or disabilities in the language skills which should be referred to specialists for attention.

I. He should have analyzed and practiced a range of teaching techniques, with particular attention to the techniques of inductive teaching.

J. He should have learned how to correlate the contents and skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing with one another and with other subjects in the curriculum.

K. He should have studied and practiced ways to foster creativity in the speaking and writing of his students.

L. He should understand the kinds of problems which censorship and propaganda can bring to the school and have learned procedures for handling specific situations.

IV *Classic Statements on Teacher Preparation in English*

• The 1958 NASDTEC Declaration of Policy on Teacher Education and Certification

The changing needs of society make increasing demands on teachers for the education of all citizens. If the teacher is to meet these demands, his education must be broader and more intensified than ever before.

Every state requires a license for those who direct the education of children and youth in order to protect and promote the educational welfare of its citizens. Similar provisions exist for licensing in all professions. The state directors of teacher education and certification are the administrators of this legal authority for state licensing of teachers. The National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, recognizing the obligation of states to provide competent teachers for their youth, will continue to work for the improvements needed in the education and certification of teachers.

NASDTEC believes that the growing and changing demands on society in the last half of the twentieth century require that:

(1) Prospective teachers be carefully selected from among our more capable college students.
(2) The beginning teacher have completed a well-planned college program of at least four years.
(3) All teachers have a broad education in the arts, the sciences and the humanities; intensive study in the subject-matter field(s) to be taught; and thorough preparation in the educational process.
(4) School districts assign teachers only to subject-matter field(s) in which they are adequately prepared.
(5) Standards and procedure for approving colleges and universities which prepare teachers be strengthened and enforced.
(6) Reciprocity in teacher certification among the states be accorded to graduates of approved teacher-education programs in colleges and universities.

NASDTEC believes that the quality of the educational program is directly affected by the quality of the teacher. Furthermore, the association believes that to attract and retain competent teachers, it is necessary that increased funds be provided to raise the economic status of teachers and to improve teaching conditions.

NASDTEC will continue to work for the objectives which its members consider vital to the needed improvement of our system of public education. The members in their respective states, as well as in their national association, will continue to work closely with lay and professional groups and persons to improve programs of teacher education throughout the United States.

* * * * *

• From *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English* and "An Articulated English Program"[1]

The report of the "Conference on Basic Issues in the Teaching of English" states clearly the motives for studying "English," and presents thirty-five interrelated issues (together with their complex implications). The conferees defined an "issue" as an unsettled point on which the possibility of taking opposed positions exists, and on which agreement is likely to be difficult. The mission of the Conferences was to define such issues, to present them as showing the parlous situation into which the teaching of English in the United States had drifted, and to provide a basic "work

[1] *The Basic Issues*, published in 1958, emerged from four conferences held under the auspices of the American Studies Association, the College English Association, the Modern Language Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English and supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation. "An Articulated English Program" written by some of the members of the Basic Issues Conferences appeared in *PMLA* (September 1959) 13-19.

paper" for concentrating the attention of members of the profession on developing solutions. Of the thirty-five Basic Issues, ten were concerned with the preparation and certification of teachers for the schools:

Elementary Level

22. How much and what kind of training in English should the elementary teacher have? Often the elementary teacher has had no course in English other than Freshman Composition and possibly a survey course. Is this enough? Should he be expected to spend some specific fraction of his college program in English courses? What levels of competence might be defined for him? What subjects are essential? Should he have more training in writing? Should he have a course in children's literature?
23. What skills should an elementary school teacher have in order to develop eagerness in pupils to learn to read and write well? The child's environment outside of school seems now to be less favorable to the development of a love of reading and a desire to write well than it used to be. How can the teacher, the school program, and the school library most effectively stimulate the student's interest? How can the teacher-in-training acquire the necessary skills?
24. How much of the teacher's training should be in education courses and how much in courses primarily devoted to language and literature? This issue is not peculiar to the subject of English, of course, and it applies to the secondary level as well as to the elementary. But the elementary teacher is the least specialized of all teachers; he quite naturally focuses his attention more upon the child than upon any one of the several subjects he teaches him. Consequently he must study child development and have various kinds of laboratory or practice-teaching experiences to train him in dealing with children. Does his training teach him enough about children's capacities for learning to read and write well? What are the most productive kinds of study in English for the prospective elementary teacher?

Secondary Level

25. Ideally, how much college study of language and literature is desirable for the secondary school teacher? English teachers should know their English. But their teaching of English is likely to be sounder if they also know at least one foreign language, other humanities, something of the social sciences and natural sciences. Should courses in language and literature occupy, say, one fourth to one third of the college curriculum of the future secondary school teacher? What gaps are there in the preparation of the English teacher at this level? What parts, if any, of his present training, both academic and professional, have little value for him?
26. What standard qualifications in English can be established for secondary school English teachers? In many communities some teachers with only a weak minor or even less training in English are assigned classes in English. Their performance as teachers may be poor because of insufficient knowledge of language and literature. Some standards should be available to guide school administrators and principals, and to enable the public to judge the quality of the schools it pays for. That a large professional group can actually agree upon a clear statement of such standards has recently been demonstrated by the teachers of modern foreign languages. What should be the standard qualifications in English?
27. What is the responsibility of liberal arts colleges in the preparation of effective teachers of English? What provisions can be made for supplementing the knowledge of liberal arts graduates and for giving appropriate laboratory experience, in order to equip them for secondary teaching in minimum time? Contrary to the general impression, most secondary school teachers come from liberal arts colleges and universities; only a small proportion come from teachers col-

leges, which generally concentrate upon preparing elementary teachers. Yet the liberal arts college frequently recognizes little or no responsibility on its part to qualify its students to teach. More exploration is needed into what kinds of courses would increase the student's command of English language and literature and at the same time count as educational training of value toward certification. What are the possibilities of spreading to the rest of the country such programs as the Master of Arts in Teaching at Harvard and Yale? Or such well-established fifth-year programs as are found in some states where a master's degree or equivalent is required of secondary teachers? Or the three-summer teacher-training program of the State of New York?

28. What kind of training in teaching methods does the future secondary school English teacher need? It seems clear that the teacher should know how to stimulate and satisfy the intellectual curiosity of the adolescent, but the pedagogical methods by which this is done are not so clear. What part of pedagogical training focuses on developing the habit of reading and fostering a love of literature? How much is known about this subject? It seems evident that much closer cooperation between Departments of English and Departments of Education is necessary if this issue is to be resolved.

29. How can the Master of Arts degree be made more effective in the preparation of secondary school teachers? This issue refers to the Master of Arts in the regular graduate department of English. This degree might serve well the needs of the secondary school teacher of English except for the fact that he is sometimes excluded from taking it because of inadequate undergraduate preparation in English and so takes his master's degree in Education, sometimes with adequate provision for content courses in English and sometimes without. The ambiguous M.A. in English is sometimes considered a baby Ph.D. degree, sometimes a consolation prize for those who cannot achieve the doctorate. Thoughtful reconsideration of the purposes and content of the M.A. program might make this degree much more serviceable for the secondary teacher and contribute significantly to the whole sequential and cumulative nature of the ideal English curriculum.

33. How can we achieve articulation of teaching and teacher training at all levels in English? If the English program is to become ideally sequential and cumulative, there must be much closer communication and cooperation among the teachers at the various levels. Some states and some national organizations have made efforts toward better articulation in recent years, but much more remains to be done. The atmosphere of mutual cordiality at the Bowling Green Conference in 1958 and the success of recent conferences of high school and college English teachers under the auspices of the Advanced Placement Program are encouraging signs that a greater degree of articulation can be obtained.

34. How can opportunities be made for continued education and intellectual growth for English teachers on all levels? Because English is a subject which requires personal involvement, the intellectual liveliness and interest of the teacher are likely to be reflected in the student. Yet many English teachers have such heavy teaching loads and supervisory duties that they cannot find the time for reading, writing, playgoing, and studying that would keep them alive and growing. Would fellowships, travel grants, summer workshops, and conferences remedy this situation?

Teacher preparation for all levels demands a more thorough knowledge of both literature and the process of writing than is customarily demanded. Every English teacher, no matter at what level, should have had a course in advanced writing.

The teacher's job, on all levels, is to

furnish the student's mind, to stimulate it, and to suggest (and hold to) high standards of student performance. A teacher unequipped with knowledge of myth, folklore, Biblical lore, and fairy tale can furnish no young mind with it, and lacking saturation in it and enthusiasm can neither adapt it to nor stimulate the child's mind for it. The same holds in increasing degree for the secondary school teacher of English in the widened sphere of literary knowledge he must have, and it is axiomatic for the college teacher.

The besetting problem of the elementary school teachers of English is knowing too little literature. The besetting problem of the English teacher in secondary school is the same, compounded by the problem of adapting the at-present rigid sort of specialized knowledge he gains from the pattern of graduate courses to effective use in high school classes. Further problems of teachers in both elementary and secondary schools derive from the sterility of their continuing professional and intellectual development. The M.A. tends to become terminal, routines of committee work set in, infrequent participation in professional or learned societies leaves teachers isolated, and the still rather formalized pattern of graduate school programs (keyed to the Ph.D. as the research degree) offers little for them.

Every elementary school teacher should have a minor in English with special courses in children's literature which include readings in the fields of myth, folk and fairy lore, and national legends, and courses in the teaching of reading and writing.

Every secondary school teacher of the subject called English should have a sound English major, of the comprehensive type mentioned above, and acquire the master's degree in English for advancement. The need is apparent for instituting a course beyond the M.A., leading perhaps to a Ph.M. (master of philosophy) degree, especially designed for teachers in senior high school and the first two years of college, but which, broad in content, might equip him to teach at higher levels too.

This course should require a full year's work in the fields of literary criticism, literary backgrounds, linguistics, and the teaching of writing.

We recommend further that teachers colleges articulate their work in English with the substance and directions suggested above for the liberal arts colleges, and that liberal arts colleges work with them to achieve this.

• • • • •

• "A Standard of Preparation To Teach English"[2]

What is a good standard of preparation to teach English? Basic to all efforts to upgrade the quality of teaching is the identification of competent teachers. To that end, a special committee of the National Council of Teachers of English has suggested the essential qualifications of an English teacher—in the elementary school, the secondary school, the college, or the university. Teaching by persons who cannot meet this standard will not produce the communication skills or the sense of human values needed so urgently in our nation. Certainly both beginning and experienced teachers must, through study and practical experience, work further to achieve and maintain the highest qualifications. The standard outlined represents only the quality of education in English needed by teachers to achieve the goals identified in the foregoing chapter; it is realistic and can be met.

While the committee's statement assumes a common basis for teachers of English, it allows for appropriate specialization to teach in each of the several positions from the elementary school to the university. The capable, industrious student should fulfill the requirements of the statement by the end of his baccalaureate or master's degree, to the extent that these apply to his preparation as a teacher in the elementary or secondary school, and by the end of his doctoral study as they relate to college teaching. Let's assume that our prospective English teacher has good opportunities to learn language and literature during his childhood and youth. Much of the basic knowledge of English as he

[2]The "Standard of Preparation to Teach English," initially prepared by the NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers, is taken from *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (Champaign: NCTE, 1961), pp. 39-42.

native language—which he understands, reads, speaks, and writes—he should have by the time he enters college. Likewise, by that time he should have read a number of major works that belong to English and American literature and some foreign pieces in the original language or English translation. He should consequently have developed a fair ability to judge and a taste to choose among literary works. During his four or five years of collegiate study, he should extend and sharpen his fundamental knowledge of the English language and literature and should acquire the special knowledge of English, together with the science and art of teaching it, which he will need for his work in the elementary or secondary school. If he intends to teach in the college or university, he should shape his program of studies to that end.

Those who subscribe to this statement hope that the teacher of English (1) has the personal qualities which make an effective teacher, (2) has received a well-balanced education, including knowledge of a foreign language and a basic grounding in science, mathematics, the social sciences, and the arts, (3) has received the appropriate training in psychology and professional education, and (4) has dedicated himself to humanistic values.

A Standard of Preparation to Teach English

I. The teacher of English should have a certain fundamental and specialized knowledge of the English language and its literature, together with certain abilities and skills which enable him to perform expertly in his discipline.
   A. In language, he should have:
      1. A fundamental knowledge of the historical development and present character of the English language: phonology (phonetics and phonemics), morphology, syntax, vocabulary (etymology and semantics), the relations of language and society.
      2. A specialized knowledge of the English language which is appropriate to the teacher's particular field of interest and responsibility.
      3. An informed command of the arts of language—rhetoric and logic; ability to speak and write language which is not only unified, coherent, and correct but also responsible, appropriate to the situation, and stylistically effective.
   B. In literature, he should have:
      1. A reading background of major literary works which emphasize the essential dignity of the individual man. This background:
         a. Implies a knowledge of major works, writers, forms, themes, and movements of the literature of the English-speaking people.
         b. Reflects intensive study of many literary pieces.
         c. Includes familiarity with some of the outstanding literary works in English translation, or in the original language, of the Greek, Roman, Norse, Italian, French, Spanish, German, Slavic, and Oriental peoples.
      2. A specialized knowledge of whatever writers and literary works, forms, themes, media, and movements are appropriate to the teacher's particular field of interest and responsibility.
      3. An ability to analyze and evaluate independently the various forms of imaginative literature as well as the utilitarian forms of verbal expression, and the insight to use suitable critical approaches in order to discover their literary and human values.

II. The teacher of English should have certain abilities and knowledge which belong to the science and the art of teaching language and literature.
   A. These abilities include:
      1. The ability to envision how his students may develop their potentialities through the study of language and literature.
      2. The ability to excite their interest and direct their learning.
      3. The ability to help them understand and use English practically and creatively.

4. The ability to elevate their taste and critical powers.
5. The ability to lead them to a perception of human problems and in appreciation of human values.
6. The ability to evaluate their progress and the efficacy of his own methods.

B. These abilities presuppose not only the fundamental but also the specialized knowledge and skills of the English language and literature which the teacher needs to fulfill his professional responsibility.

C. These abilities imply knowledge of the philosophies of education and the psychologies of learning as they relate to the study and teaching of the English language and its literature. Such knowledge:

1. Reveals how an individual unfolds and grows through his use and understanding of language and literature.
2. Supplies the teacher with a variety of methods for use in teaching his students the skills and arts which are appropriate to their level of attainment in English.
3. Informs the teacher of the relation which each phase or level has to the total school, college, and university program.
4. Includes an awareness of the basic issues in the teaching of English.

• "Resolutions Adopted at a Seminar of English Department Chairmen"[3]

The General Obligation of the Profession

1. The preparation of teachers of English and their continuing education as teachers are among the important responsibilities of college and university departments of English. These responsibilities may call for the development of sustained programs of teacher education. Departments should regularly review and evaluate their training programs for teaching assistants and their courses designed for the preparation of high school teachers. Such efforts to strengthen the teaching of English should be accepted as professional obligations; hence their vigorous promotion should not be contingent upon the receipt of Federal funds.

Activities within the Individual Institution

2. English teachers returning for post-baccalaureate study should be encouraged to enroll in courses in English and American literature and language. For those teachers who are ineligible to enroll in graduate degree programs, English departments should consider providing suitable courses and special graduate certificates.
3. The teaching of English and research in teaching will profit from joint efforts by specialists in English, English education, psychology, and other areas, and from cooperation, wherever this is appropriate, with such agencies as the United States Office of Education, state departments of education, and local schools and school systems.
4. Research in teaching and in the instruction of teachers can contribute to the same ends as a liberal discipline, inasmuch as teaching brings into focus the issues of literary and linguistic theory. Faculty members engaged in research in the teaching of English should be considered eligible for any reduction in teaching loads that is available for those engaged in literary or linguistic research, and the results should be evaluated by criteria comparable to those applied in literary and linguistic disciplines.
5. Teachers of English education should hold appointments in English departments whenever possible.

Activities Involving Other Groups

6. College and university departments of English should expand their programs of cooperation with elementary and secondary school teachers of English by providing, for example, more departmental consultants who will work with the schools and by developing special programs for teachers such as summer workshops, institutes, seminars during the regular academic year, and special conferences.

[3] From *College English*, 24 (March 1963) 473-475.

7. Continued support should be sought from Federal and other agencies, as well as from university and college administrations, for:
   (a) Summer institutes for teachers of English, patterned in general after those offered in 1962 under the sponsorship of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board.
   (b) Seminars patterned in general after those sponsored by the Commission on English in 1961 for college and university teachers of English who are preparing to serve as directors and instructors in institutes or inservice training programs.
   (c) Institutes, courses, and demonstrations in English language, composition, and literature (with or without credit) for elementary and secondary school teachers in service.
   (d) Seminars enabling college teachers of English to extend their knowledge of literature and language.
   (e) The preparation and production of printed and audio-visual materials for use in teacher-training programs.

• • • • •

• "Major Recommendations for Educating Teachers of English for the Elementary School"[4]

1. Higher standards of selection of candidates for elementary school teaching are being set up throughout the country. A candidate's qualifications should include a dynamic personality, adequate mental health, acceptable academic scholarship, interest in children, and appreciation of the function of the public schools in a democracy. Progressive evaluation of the candidate's fitness for the professional program should occur at intervals during his course, especially before he is permitted to enter student teaching.
2. In this and other aspects of the program of preparation for teaching, both academic and professional staff should cooperate.
3. Because of the importance of the candidate's cultural and professional preparation for teaching, his program should include a relatively equal emphasis upon (1) general education, (2) professional education, and (3) an academic field of concentration. The academic area should preferably be a broad one such as in natural and physical sciences, social studies, or the language arts, combining literature, language, speech, and composition.
4. In English he should have ample practice in the effective use of both oral and written language for socially valid purposes. He should understand the historical development of the English language, the processes of linguistic change, and the social bases of usage. He should also have opportunity to read major works of English and American literature with some understanding of literary types and standards of selection of books. For this purpose, shorter courses than the usual long introductory ones offered for majors in English should be made available to him. Some acquaintance with the myths and hero stories of classical literature would also be useful.
5. For this purpose the following types of courses are recommended as a minimum for all elementary school teachers: at least one course in advanced composition beyond freshman English; one in the historical development, structure, and social functions of the English language, taught with the nonmajoring student in mind; and two in literature, one covering masterpieces of American literature and one in English or world masterpieces.
6. In the professional program, teachers should understand the functions of education in a democracy, the principles of child development and learning, and the processes of curriculum planning and instruction for elementary school children. Directed obser-

[4]The recommendations are taken from Alfred Grommon, ed., *The Education of Teachers of English*, prepared by the NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1963), pp. 18-19.

vation and practice in the elementary school classroom are indispensable. So also are a course in children's literature and book selection and one in the principles of speech, including attention to creative dramatics and the oral interpretation of literature.

7. A prospective elementary school teacher should have enough undergraduate work in one academic area and preferably in two to be eligible later to pursue graduate courses in them. Academic departments might well consider permitting such students as are otherwise well qualified to enroll in whatever courses they need for strengthening their backgrounds.
8. Institutions preparing teachers for elementary schools should move as rapidly as possible toward five-year programs planned as a unified and well-articulated sequence in both academic and professional work.

• "Major Recommendations for Educating Teachers of English for the Secondary School"[5]

1. Recruiting able students for teaching should begin in secondary schools and continue in undergraduate years.
2. The entire college faculty should accept responsibility for planning programs, selecting candidates, and strengthening standards of admission for teacher education.
3. The prospective secondary school teacher should give at least 40 per cent of his study to general education, at least 40 per cent to academic specialization, no more than 20 per cent to professional preparation.
4. Instruction in general education, the major and minor, and professional preparation should emphasize the basic structures of disciplines and the interrelationships among them.
5. The minimum major or minor in English should include at least one course in composition beyond the freshman year, courses in the history of the language and in modern grammar, and training in public speaking, in addition to a balanced program in literature.
6. A minimum professional program should include study of the psychological, social, and philosophical foundations of public education, a practical course in methods, observation in schools, and practice teaching.
7. All segments of the program in teacher education should be subject to continued evaluation and intelligent revision.
8. While present requirements should be consistently enforced, teachers in schools and colleges, through their subject matter organizations, scholarly societies, and professional associations should seek jointly to strengthen certification requirements.

• "Recommendations to Improve the Quality of Instruction"[6]

For five years members of the Commission have talked and worked with English teachers in all parts of the country. Their inescapable conclusion from data and direct observation is that a high proportion—perhaps a majority—of English teachers know much less about their subject than they should know in order to teach it even reasonably well. The reasons for this condition are many and not easy to correct, but further decline is inevitable unless immediate efforts are made to improve training, to tighten certification requirements in subject study, and to make the English teacher's job more attractive.

The recommendations that follow represent not an ideal set of standards but a reasonable minimum for sound, vigorous teaching of secondary school English. Some school systems already require and provide more than these recommendations set forth, and the fact that their graduates regularly perform better than the average in national examinations such as the College Board Advanced Placement Examinations is evidence enough that these recommendations mark a level below which schools cannot oper-

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[6] The recommendations are taken from *Freedom and Discipline in English: Report of the Commission on English* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), pp. 9-13. The recommendations on curriculum are not included.

ate without impairing the quality of instruction they offer.

Professional Standards

Certification standards in most states are far too low to guarantee that teachers admitted to the classroom are adequately prepared for the work they must do. The argument that short supply makes increased requirements impossible is self-defeating. Experience in other professions has shown that in the long run both quality and supply increase when requirements rise, because able students are attracted to those professions which set high standards for admission. Because the machinery of state certification is complex and difficult to change, the onus at present must fall on college and university English departments to set, independently, sound requirements for graduation with teaching certificates in English.

Recommendation 1. That certification to teach secondary school English be based on evidence of creditable work, at the minimum, of the following kinds:

formal study of the history and structure of the English language

study in rhetoric and composition above the level of freshman course

work in critical theory and practice with attention to bibliography and library resources

at least one course in speech and the oral interpretation of literature

two semester courses in American literature

four semester courses in English literature, of which one should be the study of a single writer (preferably Shakespeare) in depth, and of which others should represent approaches not exclusively historical

at least one course in English social and cultural history

enough study of one foreign language to guarantee reading facility.

Recommendation 2. That, in addition to the minimal requirements in subject matter, study in pedagogical processes include the following:

one course in the psychology of learning

one course in the methodology of the subject (selection of materials, lesson planning, curriculum development, review of relevant research)

one course in the history of American educational theory and institutions

one semester of full-time practice teaching under close and competent supervision.

Recommendation 3. That temporary certificates be valid for only one year at a time with renewal dependent on evidence of professional study, in the subject or in pedagogical processes, whichever may be lacking in the candidate's preparation to meet the requirements listed under 1 and 2.

Recommendation 4. That school systems assume some responsibility for the expense of study beyond that required for certification, through stipends, tuition-free courses, and substantial salary increments.

Teaching Conditions

Although situations differ so greatly that what may be reasonable teaching conditions in one place will be unreasonably difficult in another, the consensus of English teachers is that unless a ceiling for the teaching assignment can be established (Recommendations 5 through 7) there is little hope for materially improved instruction.

Recommendation 5. That the English teacher be assigned no more than four classes.

Recommendation 6. That the average class size be no more than 25 pupils.

Recommendation 7. That the English teacher be responsible for supervision of no more than one continuing extracurricular activity during a school year.

Recommendations 8 through 11 go beyond teaching assignments to spell out provision for space, equipment, and clerical assistance that would be taken for granted in business or in another profession but are far too seldom available to the teacher.

Recommendation 8. That specific classrooms be set aside for English.

Recommendation 9. That each of these classrooms be equipped with reference

books and filing cabinets and wired for audio-visual machines, and that all English teachers have access to a record player, tape recorder, television set, slide machine, motion-picture projector, and an opaque or overhead projector.

Recommendation 10. That space be provided for an English office equipped with a typewriter and a duplicating machine, and that clerical assistance be available for the cutting of stencils and the production of teaching materials.

Recommendation 11. That in addition to the annual budget for the school library, at least $1 per student per year be allotted for purchase and rental of special materials in English (books, slides, photographs, special issues of magazines, films, and the like).

• • • • •

• "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement"[7]

The Illinois State-wide Curriculum Center for Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English (ISCPET) is supported by funds supplied in accordance with a contract with the U. S. Office of Education. Representatives of the twenty institutions[8] involved in ISCPET are conducting a five-year study of ways of improving teacher preparation. They have prepared as a working guide the preliminary lists of qualifications that follow. The representatives, drawn from Departments of English and Education, base this statement upon their own experience and observation; upon the recommendations of an advisory committee composed of twelve nationally known persons in English, Speech, and Education; and upon additional recommendations from Illinois authorities on certification, school administrators, secondary school English consultants, English department heads, and English teachers.

The lists have these five headings: Knowledge of Language; Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition; Knowledge and Skill in Literature; Knowledge and Skill in Oral Communication; and Knowledge and Skill in the Teaching of English.

Although no specific list of competencies in general education has been prepared, there is a consensus that any teacher of English should possess at least basic knowledge of social science, natural science, and the humanities other than English, including at least a fair command of a foreign language. No attempt has been made to list the personal qualities that are involved in successful teaching. Such a list, incorporating as it must such varied items as integrity, willingness to work hard, liking for children, and a pleasant voice, would be little more than a catalog of virtues desirable in any human being.

Persons responsible for planning college curriculums based upon the competencies must realize that no one-to-one ratio exists between competencies and courses. That is, the attainment of one competency may require more than one college course, and, conversely, a single course may sometimes provide sufficient instruction to cover several of the competencies.

In these lists, the "minimal" level of qualification describes the competencies to be expected of a secondary school English teacher who has no more than a teaching minor in English. It may, however, also describe the competencies of an English major whose ability is only mediocre or whose college preparation has been of less than average quality.

The "good" level of qualification describes competencies reasonable to expect in able or fairly able English majors whose ability and college preparation have been average or better in quality.

[7] From *College English*, 27 (November 1965) 166-169.

[8] Aurora College
Bradley University
De Paul University
Greenville College
Illinois State University at Normal
Illinois Wesleyan University
Knox College
Loyola University
Monmouth College
Mundelein College
North Central College
Northwestern University
Olivet Nazarene College
Rockford College
Roosevelt University
St. Xavier College
Southern Illinois University
University of Chicago
University of Illinois
Western Illinois University

The "superior" level of qualification describes competencies to be expected in highly able persons whose college preparation has been of very good or excellent quality; it is likely to include graduate work and may require some years of teaching experience.

The "minimal" qualifications are not recommended. Rather, they are basic to attaining the "good" qualifications. Each college or university engaged in preparing secondary school teachers of English should, in the opinion of those responsible for this report, attempt to prepare teachers who have attained at least the "good" level.

J. N. Hook
University of Illinois

1. Knowledge of Language

Minimal	Good	Superior
An understanding of how language functions	A detailed understanding of how language functions, including knowledge of the principles of semantics	
A reasonably detailed knowledge of one system of English grammar and a working familiarity with another system	A detailed knowledge of at least two systems of English grammar	
A knowledge of the present standards of educated usage: knowledge of the various levels of usage and how those levels are determined	A thorough knowledge of levels of usage; some knowledge of dialectology, a realization of the cultural implications of both A knowledge of the history of the English language, with appropriate awareness of its phonological, morphological, and syntactic changes	Sufficient knowledge to illustrate richly and specifically the areas listed under "good"

2. Knowledge and Skill in Written Composition

Minimal	Good	Superior
Ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage	A well-developed ability to recognize such characteristics of good writing as substantial and relevant content; organization; clarity; appropriateness of tone; and accuracy in mechanics and usage	In addition to "good" competencies, a detailed knowledge of theories and history of rhetoric and of the development of English prose
A basic understanding of the processes of composing	Perception of the complexities in the processes of composing	Perception of the subtleties, as well as the complexities, in the processes of composing
Ability to analyze and to communicate to students the specific strengths and weaknesses in their writing	Ability to analyze in detail the strengths and weaknesses in the writing of students and to communicate the analysis effectively	Ability to give highly perceptive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses in the writing of students, to communicate this exactly, and to motivate students toward greater and greater strengths
Ability to produce writing with at least a modicum of the characteristics noted above	Proficiency in producing writing with at least considerable strength in the characteristics noted above	Proficiency in producing writing of genuine power; ability and willingness to write for publication

3. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN LITERATURE

Minimal	Good	Superior
Acquaintance with the most important works of major English and American authors	Familiarity with the important works of major English and American authors; knowledge of the characteristics of various genres and of major works in English and American literature in the genres	In addition to the "good" competencies: Intensive and extensive knowledge of one or more major authors and of at least one genre, and one period; knowledge of major works of selected foreign writers, both ancient and modern, and of comparative literature
Awareness of the patterns of development of English and American literature from their beginnings to the present	As part of the awareness of patterns of development, a knowledge of such backgrounds of English and American literature as history, the Bible, mythology, and folklore	
Ability to read closely an unfamiliar literary text of average difficulty with comprehension of its content and salient literary characteristics	Ability to read closely an unfamiliar literary text of above-average difficulty with good comprehension of its content and literary characteristics Familiarity with a considerable body of literature suitable for adolescents	Familiarity with major critical theories and schools of criticism

4. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN ORAL COMMUNICATION

Minimal	Good	Superior
An understanding of basic principles of preparing and presenting an oral report	An understanding of the principles of group discussion, group dynamics, oral reporting, panel discussions, classroom dramatizations, and choral reading; an understanding of the relationships between speaking and other facets of English	In addition to the "good" competencies: touches of expertise and showmanship that a professional speaker, oral interpreter, or actor possesses
An awareness of the role of listening in communication	A knowledge of current information relative to listening techniques	
An ability to speak with clarity and in conformity with present standards of educated usage	An ability to speak clearly and effectively, and in conformity with present standards of educated usage	
An ability to read aloud well enough for ready comprehension	An ability to read aloud well enough to convey most aspects of the interpretive art—meaning, mood, dominant emotions, varying emotions, overtones, and variety	

5. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Minimal	Good	Superior
Some understanding of basic principles of educational psychology	Knowledge of educational psychology, especially of the learning process and adolescent psychology	Competence in the knowledge and application of educational psychology; detailed knowledge of the stages of language growth in children and youth
Introductory knowledge of American secondary education	Knowledge of the philosophy, organization, and educational programs of American secondary education now and in historical perspective	
A basic understanding of the content, instructional materials, and organization of secondary English programs	A good understanding of the content, instructional materials, and organization of secondary English programs, and of the role of English in the total school program	A thorough understanding of the content, instructional materials, and organization of secondary English programs, and of the role of English in the total school program; knowledge of principles of curriculum development in English
A basic knowledge of ways to teach English, with an awareness of the importance of developing assignments that guide students in their study of language, written and oral communciation, and literature	A wide knowledge of effective ways to teach English, to select and adapt methods and materials for the varying interests and maturity levels of students, and to develop a sequence of assignments to guide and stimulate students in their study of language, written and oral communication, and literature	A thorough knowledge of the most effective ways to teach English, to select and adapt methods and materials for the varying interests and maturity levels of students, and to develop sequential assignments that guide, stimulate, and challenge students in their study of language, written and oral communication, and literature
Some knowledge of corrective and developmental reading techniques	Moderate knowledge of corrective and developmental reading techniques	A relatively thorough knowledge of corrective and developmental reading techniques
Understanding of basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English	Broad understanding of basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English	Thorough understanding of basic principles of evaluation and test construction in English

• • • • •

- **"Resolutions of the Anglo-American Conference on the Teaching and Learning of English"[9]**

A blueprint for redirecting the focus of English teaching in Anglo-American countries emerged from the deliberations of more than fifty scholars and specialists in the teaching of English at a month-long meeting at Dartmouth College held in August and September 1966 under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

[9]For reports on the Conference, see John Dixon, *Growth Through English* (Reading, England: The National Association of Teachers of English, 1967), and Herbert J. Muller, *The Uses of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967).

In concentrated sessions conferees from the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States reviewed current practice, research and development, and promising new ideas affecting the teaching of English and the preparation of teachers for all educational levels.

Calling for determined action to review and reform the teaching of English in British and American schools, Seminar participants reported general agreement on the following eleven-point program:

1. The centrality of pupils' exploring, extending, and shaping experiences in the English classroom.
2. The urgency of developing classroom approaches stressing the vital, creative, dramatic involvement of children and young people in language experiences.
3. The importance of directing more attention to speaking and listening for all pupils at all levels, particularly those experiences which involve vigorous interaction among children.
4. The wisdom of providing young people at all levels with significant opportunities for the creative uses of language–creative dramatics, imaginative writing, improvisation, role playing, and similar activities.
5. The significance of rich literary experiences in the educative process and the importance of teachers of English restudying particular selections to determine their appropriateness for reading at different levels.
6. The need to overcome the restrictiveness of rigid patterns of "grouping" or "streaming" which limit the linguistic environment in which boys and girls learn English and which tend to inhibit language development.
7. The need to negate the limiting, often stultifying, impact of examination patterns which direct attention of both teachers and pupils to aspects of English which are at best superficial and often misleading.
8. The compelling urgency of improving the conditions under which English is taught in the schools–the need for more books and libraries, for better equipment, for reasonable class size, for a classroom environment which will make good teaching possible.
9. The importance of teachers of English at all levels informing themselves about the scholarship and research in the English language so that their classroom approaches may be guided accordingly.
10. The need for radical reform in programs of teacher education, both preservice and inservice.
11. The importance of educating the public on what is meant by good English and what is meant by good English teaching.

The Importance of the Study

(Continued from page 477)

English teaching really requires. Some people think the requirements of the Guidelines are unrealistically difficult. Others feel that they are so general that they cannot be effective. These criticisms may be valid. But the reactions of the hundreds of experienced individuals involved in this study persuaded me and persuaded the other members of the Advisory Board who sat through the countless conferences and meetings all over the country that led up to the guidelines that any English department or any school system that will try honestly to plan a program in accord with these guidelines will "professionalize" its teachers and thereby improve its English teaching to a striking degree.

V *Certification Requirements To Teach English in Elementary or Secondary School—1967*

Eugene E. Slaughter

Head, Department of English
Southeastern Oklahoma State College
Durant, Oklahoma

THIS report on 1967 teacher certification updates the similar study of 1964 and continues the surveys by John H. Fisher of the requirements to teach English in the high school and by an NCTE committee of the requirements to teach language arts in the elementary school. The data have been obtained from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and compared with the comprehensive studies of Stinnett (1967) and Woellner and Wood (1967-68). Differences between the figures in the manuals and those contained here are not noted unless they affect an interpretation. Two definitions which are used here to classify all certificates vary from the manuals' use. A *regular initial certificate* is taken to mean a probationary or provisional certificate issued, and renewable or continuing, on state prescribed requirements, in contrast to an emergency or temporary certificate granted by special dispensation. A *standard certificate* is a regular certificate which is permanent or may be continued on a prescribed number of years' use in teaching and with little or no further preparation.[1]

State requirements for teacher certification consider age, citizenship, health, moral character, college studies, and teaching competence. Regarding preparation, they imply that a teacher needs (1) a liberal education, (2) one or more concentrations in subjects or areas of knowledge commonly taught in the schools, (3) a professional education that includes the psychological and sociological foundations of the teaching-learning process, teaching methods, and student teaching, and (4) for the elementary school, a subject matter specialized for teaching to

[1] Studies referred to are these: John H. Fisher, "We Look to the High Schools," *College English*, 16 (March 1955) 362-365; "Certification of High School Teachers," *College English*, 19 (May 1958) 344-348; "1960 Certification Requirements," *College English*, 22 (January 1961) 271-275; Eugene E. Slaughter, "1964 Certification to Teach English in the Elementary or the Secondary School," *College English*, 25 (May 1964) 591-604; NCTE committee, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (1961), pp. 39-48; T. M. Stinnett, with Edna N. Frady and Geraldine E. Pershing, *A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967); Elizabeth H. Woellner and M. Aurilla Wood, *Requirements for Certification, 1967-68* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1967); NCTE guidelines for the preparation to teach English and the language arts in the elementary and the secondary school were published in Alfred H. Grommon, editor, *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools* (Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).

children. Among the states, although the statutes specify certain requirements to be enforced, there is an increasing practice of publishing guidelines for planning and judging programs of teacher education, of accrediting colleges and universities, approving their programs, and depending on the institutions to recommend the graduates as to character, preparation, and competency before the certificates are issued. Indeed, most states report using the approved-program approach to some extent (see Stinnett, p. 35). There is also an increasing practice of granting a provisional first license on the approved college program and permitting successful teachers to convert the initial certificate into one which is valid or renewable as long as they are teaching. For the conversion, there is a tendency to require a fifth year of college as well as successful classroom experience, and to recognize by certificate the study done beyond the master's degree. Certification is intended to ensure minimum preparation and competence in elementary and secondary school teachers—when they begin and as they continue to teach. Proper assignment of licensed teachers according to their qualifications depends upon the professional integrity of the school administrators and the teachers. It is enforced by a state's granting of funds and accreditation to the public schools that observe the teachers' credentials, and the withholding of funds and accreditation from offenders. Standards for accrediting schools are included in this study when they enforce a minimum preparation of teachers.[2]

The total amount of college credit required for certification varies considerably. Of the 52 states (this term will hereafter include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), 46 require the bachelor's degree for the *lowest regular elementary* school certificate, and 6 (Idaho, Nebraska, North Dakota, Puerto Rico, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) require 2 years of college. For the *standard elementary* certificate, 48 states require the bachelor's degree, and 11 of these require a fifth year of college within 10 years after the teacher begins teaching: Arizona and New York, 5 years; Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington, 6 years; California and Indiana, 7 years; New Mexico, 8 years; Connecticut, Kentucky, and Maryland, 10 years. Until new regulations become effective, in 4 states an elementary teacher with a provisional certificate may obtain successive renewals on a few more college hours and so teach a long while before completing the bachelor's degree: in rural Nebraska, 24 years, in North Dakota, Puerto Rico, and South Dakota, indefinitely. For the *lowest regular secondary* school certificate, the District of Columbia requires the master's degree, and the other 51 states require the bachelor's degree. For the *standard secondary* certificate, all states require the bachelor's degree, and 13 of them require a fifth year of college within 10 years: District of Columbia as prerequisite, Arizona, California, and New York, 5 years; Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Washington, 6 years; Indiana, 7 years; New Mexico, 8 years; Connecticut, Kentucky, and Maryland, 10 years.[3]

SINCE 1964 there has been an increase in the college preparation required for certification, and a further increase announced. For the standard elementary or secondary certificate Kentucky requires a fifth year of preparation to be completed by the tenth year of service. Idaho has moved from a 3-year college requirement to a bachelor's degree for the lowest regular secondary certificate. For the initial elementary certificate,

[2] State standards of school accreditation are influenced by regional associations, especially the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for 19 states and the Northwest Association for 7 states. The NCA requires that the high school English teacher have at least 18 semester hours in the English area, with adequate preparation in each subject taught; the NWA, at least 16 hours, with 6 hours in each subject.

[3] Because he defines the lowest regular certificate differently, Dr. Stinnett reports California as having a 5-year minimum college preparation for the elementary or secondary school teacher, Idaho requiring the bachelor's degree as a minimum for the elementary school teacher, and Arizona setting a fifth year of college as a minimum for the secondary school teacher. California issues a conditional credential on a bachelor's degree for secondary teachers through 5 years of service, and for elementary teachers through 7 years. Arizona grants an initial secondary certificate, valid 5 years, on a bachelor's degree.

Nebraska has raised the minimum from 40 to 60 semester hours, and Montana from 2 years of college to a bachelor's degree. Announced increases in minimums for the lowest regular elementary certificate are these: Idaho, 96 semester hours in 1968, bachelor's degree in 1972; North Dakota, bachelor's degree in 1969; South Dakota, bachelor's degree for independent school districts in 1968, for rural schools in 1970; Wisconsin, bachelor's degree in 1972.

The tables at the end of this survey give the elementary certificate requirements, expressed in semester hours, which each state reported for 1964 and 1967 as minimums in English (including speech, dramatics, and journalism), in professional education, and in reading methods, children's literature, and combined language arts for the elementary school. For the English area, the requirements range from 6 to 24 hours, with clustering at 6 and 12 hours, for both years; median 8 hours in 1964, 6 hours in 1967. In 1967, 5 states reported higher minimums, and 1 state lower, than in 1964. The states and their changes of English minimums from 1964 to 1967 are as follows: Virginia increased from 15 to 18 hours; Mississippi, 12 to 15; Arkansas, 6 to 12; Delaware, 8 to 12; and Illinois, 8 to 9; Vermont decreased from 18 to 15 hours. For professional education, the requirements range from 16 to 36 hours in 1964, 16 to 40 hours in 1967; for both years, median, 24 hours, with clusterings at 18, 20, 24, and 30 hours. In 1967, 6 states reported higher minimums, and 4 states lower, than in 1964. The states and their changes of education minimums from 1964 to 1967 are as follows: Puerto Rico increased from 21 to 24 hours; Kentucky, 24 to 33; Idaho, 20 to 24; North Carolina, 18 to 24; Ohio, 21 to 28; Wyoming, 20 to 23; Alabama decreased from 30 to 27; Illinois, 18 to 16; New Hampshire, 27 to 24; Utah, 30 to 26 hours. Most states did not report specific requirements in elementary school language arts, even though they indicated a requirement in the area. By the states that specified, 2 to 3 hours each for reading methods and children's literature were reported in 1964 and 1967; and for combined language arts a range from 2 to 12 hours, median, 3 hours, for both years.

The tables at the end of this survey also give the secondary certificate requirements, expressed in semester hours, which each state reported for 1964 and 1967. The required professional education ranges from 12 to 30 hours, median 18 hours, for both years. In 1967, 6 states reported higher minimums for education, and 2 states, lower, than in 1964. The states and their changes of education requirements from 1964 to 1967 are these: Puerto Rico increased from 21 to 24 hours; Kentucky, 17 to 26; Ohio, 17 to 18; Montana, 16 to 18; Arizona, 24 to 30; Utah, 18 to 21 hours; the District of Columbia decreased from 18 to 15 hours; Alabama 24 to 21 hours. The minimum in English (often including speech, dramatics, and journalism) required for teaching English as a full load of 3 or more classes ranges from 12 to 40 hours, median, 24 hours, for both years. More specifically, in 1967, for teaching English as a principal assignment in high school, 3 states require the teacher to have only 12 hours of college English; 5 states, 15 hours; 2 states, 16 hours; 9 states, 18 hours; 1 state, 19 hours; 2 states, 20 hours; 1 state, 22 hours; 14 states, 24 hours; 1 state, 28 hours; 8 states, 30 hours; 5 states, 36 hours; 1 state, 40 hours. In 1967, 5 states showed an increase, 6 states a decrease, as compared to 1964 English minimums for a major teaching assignment. The 6 states whose reports indicate a decrease in the English requirement are Puerto Rico down from 36 to 30 hours; New Mexico, 24 to 18; Oklahoma, 24 to 18; West Virginia, 24 to 18; Alaska, 16 to 12; Colorado, 18 to 12 hours. The states showing increases in the English preparation required for teaching a full English load are these: Minnesota from 15 to 36; North Carolina, 30 to 36; Virginia, 24 to 30; Wyoming, 24 to 30; Utah, 12 to 15 hours. The 13-year box score on the relation of the states' education and English requirements for the English teacher in high school is as follows:

	1954	1957	1960	1964	1967
Less education than English	11	15	25	32	29
Same amount of each	7	5	7	5	6
More education than English	31	29	20	15	17
Total states	49	49	52	52	52

The major, especially a teaching major in the area of English, is receiving increased attention. In the 1960 reports, 23 states marked the requirement "unspecified," in 1964 only 9 states failed to supply statistics or description for the English major, and in 1967, with the trend continuing steadily toward the use of an approved program for teacher education, only 4 states replied "unspecified," three of whom declared they were permitting the institutions to plan the major program. The tables, below, with the notes on them, reveal a desire to have prospective English teachers follow a full pattern of college studies in literature and the English language, not only in the bachelor's program but also in graduate courses. Guidelines issued by the states for a teaching area in English require from 24 to 51 hours in 1964, 18 to 54 hours in 1967, median, 30 hours for both years. These requirements reported for 1967 are distributed as follows: 1 state, 54 hours; 1 state, 51 hours; 2 states, 50 hours; 2 states, 48 hours; 1 state, 42 hours; 1 state, 40 hours; 8 states, 36 hours; 1 state, 34 hours; 3 states, 32 hours; 16 states, 30 hours; 1 state, 28 hours; 1 state, 25 hours; 9 states, 24 hours; 1 state, 18 hours; 4 states, unspecified.

The credit which is allowed on the English certificate for college courses in speech, dramatics, and journalism is often unspecified (19 states). When reported, it ranges from 0 to 18 hours in 1964, from 0 to 36 hours in 1967; median for both years is 6 hours. Sometimes this allowance appears to be a compromise made to obtain enough teachers to fill school positions, but it also reflects a conviction that an English teacher needs college preparation in these areas. Effects of counting speech, etc., on the English minimum are illustrated by the 1967 reports of 16 states. New Mexico provides a composite of 54 hours in the English area, allows 36 hours for speech, etc., nets 18 hours for language, literature, and composition. The comparable figures for others run thus: Connecticut, District of Columbia, and Virginia, 12 of 30, net 18 hours; Missouri, 5 of 24, nets 19; West Virginia, 3 of 20, nets 17; Illinois, 8 of 24, nets 16; Utah, 27 of 42, nets 15; Kansas, 9 of 24, nets 15; South Dakota, 10 of 25, nets 15; Arizona, 5 of 18, nets 13; Alabama and Wyoming, 6 of 18, net 12; Idaho, 18 of 30, nets 12; Nevada and North Dakota, 6 of 16, nets 10 hours. Only 13 states in 1967 (2 states fewer than in 1964) require every one who teaches English in high school to have at least 20 semester hours in English language, literature, and composition, *not* including speech, dramatics, and journalism. They are Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Puerto Rico, Tennessee, Texas, and Washington.

For teaching English in high school less than half time, 12 states do not require as much college English as for teaching a full load. Delaware, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania require 36 hours for teaching English full time and 18 hours for 2 classes; likewise, New Hampshire, 30 and 12; Puerto Rico, 30 and 24; Wyoming, 30 and 18; Vermont, 30 and 15; Oregon, 28 and 20; Nebraska, 24 and 18; Arkansas and Hawaii, 24 and 12; Massachusetts, 18 and 9. The minimums for a part load of English which are given in the tables below range from 9 to 40 hours of college English (sometimes allowing speech, dramatics, and journalism), with clustering at 24, for both years; median is 20 in 1964, 18 in 1967. In 1967 these minimums are distributed as follows: 1 state, 40 hours; 2 states, 36 hours; 4 states, 30 hours; 12 states, 24 hours; 1 state, 22 hours; 3 states, 20 hours; 1 state, 19 hours; 13 states, 18 hours; 2 states, 16 hours; 6 states, 15 hours; 6 states, 12 hours; 1 state, 9 hours. In 1967, 4 states reported higher minimums, and 7 states lower, than in 1964. The 7 states showing a decrease are Puerto Rico down from 36 to 24 hours, Vermont from 30 to 15, Delaware and New Mexico and Wyoming from 24 to 18, Colorado from 18 to 12, Alaska from 16 to 12. The states reporting an increase in minimums for a part load are these: North Carolina from 30 to 36 hours, Virginia from 24 to 30, Minnesota from 15 to 18, Utah from 12 to 15.

1967 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
TO TEACH ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Expressed in Semester Hours
A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified. U-R = unspecified-required.

STATE	(1) Minimum College English (including speech, etc.)		Specialized Subject Matter in English Language Arts						(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
			(2) Reading Methods		(3) Children's Literature		(4) Language Arts in general			
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Puerto Rico	24	24	U	U	U	U	U-R	U-R	21	24
Kentucky	18	18	U	U	3	3	U	U	24	24+9G
Virginia	15	18	U	U	U	U	3	U	18	18
Indiana	15	15	U	U	U-R	U-R	U	U	27	27
Louisiana	15	15	U	U	3	3	3	3	24	24
Mississippi	12	15	3	3	3	3	3	3	36	39
Vermont	18	15	U	U	U	U	3	3	18	18
West Virginia	15	15	3	3	U	3	U	U	20	20
Alabama	14	14	U	U	U	U	U	U	30	27
Maine	14	14	U	U	U	U	U	U	30	30

Puerto Rico. Whether based on the 60-hour normal diploma or the bachelor's degree, the certificate requires 24 hours in English and a course in the teaching of English as a second language.

* * * * *

Kentucky. Approved program of general education requires 24 hours including composition, literature, and electives in speech and humanities.

* * * * *

Virginia. The 18 hours of English shown in the table includes children's literature and language arts. According to the applicant's preparation, the certificate is endorsed for Grades 4-7, Grades 1-3, or kindergarten (which requires 24 hours of special work in health, educational, and developmental needs of children under 6 years old). A postgraduate certificate is also granted on the master's or the doctor's degree.

* * * * *

Indiana. Provisional certificate specifies 15 hours including structure of English language, oral and written expression, world and children's literature. Professional certificate, based on master's degree, requires 8 hours of graduate credit in each subject converted to professional endorsement.

* * * * *

Louisiana. Usual requirement in elementary language arts is 3 hours of speech and 3 hours of children's literature as part of 22 hours of elementary specialization.

* * * * *

Mississippi. Class-A elementary school teacher's certificate, based on an approved bachelor's degree program, requires 12 hours of English and 3 hours of speech as part of 48 hours in general education, 3 hours of reading methods and 3 hours of language arts combination as part of 18 hours in professional education, and 3 hours of children's literature as part of 24 hours in specialized elementary education.

* * * * *

Vermont. The state is phasing out elementary certificates issued on less than the bachelor's degree; 1970 will end those granted on two years of college preparation. The certificate based on a bachelor's degree requires completion of program approved for elementary teacher education at a bachelor's degree, plus 18 hours of professional education which includes 3 hours of language arts and 9 hours of elementary curriculum and teaching. For a certificate a kindergarten teacher must complete an approved bachelor's degree program for kindergarten or complete an elementary certificate program plus 9 hours of content, materials, and methods for kindergarten level.

* * * * *

West Virginia. Both provisional and professional certificate require 15 hours of English composition, grammar, literature, and speech, and 20 hours of education with 3 hours in reading methods.

* * * * *

Alabama. 1967 data in table are for class-B elementary professional certificate, which is valid for 8 years. The 14 hours of English must include one course in speech. Class-A elementary professional certificate, valid 10 years, requires a master's degree in elementary education; class-AA elementary professional certificate, valid 12 years, requires completion of a sixth-year program of graduate study (a year beyond the master's degree) in a standard institution approved for a doctoral degree. All three classes of certificate may be continued upon evidence of a specified period of successful teaching or additional study.

* * * * *

Maine. Provisional certificate is renewable every 5 years upon teaching and 6 hours of additional credit.

1967 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO TEACH ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified. U-R = unspecified-required.

STATE	(1) Minimum College English (including speech, etc.)		Specialized Subject Matter in English Language Arts: (2) Reading Methods		(3) Children's Literature		(4) Language Arts in general		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
[illegible]	6	12	U	U	U	3	U	U	18	18
[illegible]	8	12	3	3	U	U	U	U	30	30
[illegible]	12	12	U	U	2	U	U-R	U	20	24
[illegible]	12	12	U	U	U	U	2	U	26	26
[illegible]	12	12	U	U	U	U	U	U	18	18
[illegible] Carolina	12	12	U	2	2	3	U	U	18	24
[illegible]	12	12	U	2	3	3	3	U	21	28
[illegible]	12	12	U-R	U-R	U	U	U-R	U-R	18+12G	18+12G
[illegible] Carolina	12	12	U-R	3	3	3	U	U	21	21
[illegible]	12	12	U	U	U	U	12	12	24	24
[illegible]	12	12	U	U	U	U	6	6	18	18
[illegible]	8	9	2	2	U	U	U-R	9	18	16
[illegible] Dakota	U	9	U	3	U	3	U	8	16	16

Arkansas. Data are for standard certificate. Any one qualified for it may qualify for an elementary classroom teacher's master certificate by completion of a master's degree including 12 hours of psychology and education related to the elementary curriculum and 12 hours of subject matter courses.

* * * * *

Delaware. Teaching of reading is required as part of the 30 hours in professional education.

* * * * *

Idaho. Provisional certificate, which is considered an emergency license although it is valid 3 years and is renewable on 18 hours of additional college work toward the standard certificate, does not specify how much English; it requires 8 hours in education.

* * * * *

Maryland. Advanced professional certificate, required after 10 years of teaching under a standard certificate, is issued on a master's degree or an approved program of 36 hours—of which one half is elective content and one half may be in professional education courses.

* * * * *

Nebraska. Requirements above are for the regular certificate based on a bachelor's degree. Also, for the elementary teacher an initial rural school certificate is issued on 60 hours in teacher education. A professional certificate is issued on an approved fifth-year program.

* * * * *

South Carolina. Professional education of 24 hours includes 6 semester hours of full-time student teaching. Minimum scores required on National Teacher Examinations (common and appropriate field) in 1968 are 500 at bachelor's degree level, 600 at master's degree level.

* * * * *

Ohio. No comment.

* * * * *

Pennsylvania. Data above are for the permanent certificate. Provisional certificate requires 12 hours in the humanities, 18 hours of education, and 18 hours of elementary specialization including language arts and reading methods. The pattern allows 18-24 hours of concentration in an academic field. To the provisional certificate, the permanent certificate adds 24 hours of graduate credit, 12 in education and 12 in academic subjects.

* * * * *

South Carolina. Regular certificate requires 12 hours of English composition and literature, 3 hours of children's literature in elementary specialization, and reading methods in education. A one-year provisional certificate is issued on a bachelor's degree which does not include the required professional education. See Secondary Requirements for note on use of examinations for certification.

* * * * *

Tennessee. Professional certificate requires 6 hours of communications and 10 hours of humanities including literature, and 24 hours of education, and allows 12 hours of language arts in 26 hours of elementary specialization. Temporary certificate, renewable every 2 years on 8 additional hours, initially requires 4 hours of education, and does not specify otherwise. An endorsement for kindergarten to Grade 3 requires additional study in child growth and development for ages 5-10 and in appropriate materials and methods. An advanced certificate is issued on the master's degree.

* * * * *

Texas. Data in table are minimums for either the provisional certificate based on the bachelor's degree or the professional certificate issued on a fifth-year college program.

* * * * *

Illinois. All standard elementary, high school, or special certificates are issued on the basis of graduation from an approved program in an Illinois institution or an out-of-state institution accredited by the NCATE.

* * * * *

North Dakota. Data in table were reported as typical for teacher assignment. Whether the certificate is granted on 64 hours or the bachelor's degree, the requirement in English and elementary specialization are set by the accredited college, and the minimum in education is 16 hours. Bachelor's degree will be required as a minimum after July 1969.

1967 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
TO TEACH ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Expressed in Semester Hours
A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified. U-R = unspecified-required.

STATE	(1) Minimum College English (including speech, etc.)		Specialized Subject Matter in English Language Arts						(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
			(2) Reading Methods		(3) Children's Literature		(4) Language Arts in general			
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Missouri	8	8	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	20
South Dakota	7	7	U	U	U	U	U-R	U-R	26	26
California	6	6	U	U	U	U	U	U	20	20
Connecticut	6	6	U	U	U	U	U	U	30	30
New Jersey	6	6	U-R	U-R	U	U-R	U-R	U-R	30+U	30
New Mexico	6	6	U	U	U-R	U-R	3	2	24+6G	30
Oklahoma	6	6	U	U	U	U	6	6	21	21

Missouri. Regular certificate requires 5 hours of composition, rhetoric, and grammar, plus 3 hours of speech or English. Of the 20 hours required in education, 4 to 5 must be in reading methods and language arts, and of the specialization, 2 hours must be in children's literature. Provisional certificate permits deficiencies of 24 hours, but the teacher must have 5 hours in education.

* * * * *

South Dakota. Both the baccalaureate and the 60-hour certificate require 7 hours in English: composition 5, speech 2. The 26 hours of education required by the degree must include a course in language arts. The 60-hour certificate requires 15 hours of education. For certification teachers must have at least a bachelor's degree to teach in independent school districts after July 1968 or in rural schools after 1970.

* * * * *

California. An applicant for a certificate must have a year of English and demonstrated competence in composition for the bachelor's degree. He may also have English as the required minor or major, or he may include English as one subject in the humanities diversified major. Regular credential requires 5 years of college preparation; conditional credential (based on bachelor's degree) is limited to a total life of 7 years.

* * * * *

Connecticut. Data apply to both initial and continuing certificate. An applicant who presents a planned program of college preparation, including practice teaching, but lacks not more than 6 hours in specific required courses may be issued a one-year certificate. Within 10 years the initial certificate must be converted into the standard certificate, which requires a fifth year of college.

New Jersey. Besides 30 hours of educational theory, including reading methods and language arts, the regular certificate requires 150 clock hours of student teaching, 90 of which must be classroom teaching. An emergency elementary school certificate may be issued on 90 hours of college credit.

* * * * *

New Mexico. Data above apply to the continuing elementary school certificate for teachers. Guidelines for a provisional (initial) certificate prescribe 6 hours of English, 2 hours of language arts and children's literature in 24 hours of elementary specialization, and unspecified hours in methods as part of 24 hours in education. The provisional certificate cannot be renewed beyond a total use of 8 years. For the continuing five-year elementary certificate, based on a planned five-year college program with 30 graduate hours, unspecified hours may be in language arts as part of 12 hours in specialized content and 6 hours of education. Also, English may be an area of concentration, 18 or 24 hours at baccalaureate level, 18 to 36 hours at graduate level. A language arts specialist in the elementary school must have a valid elementary certificate with a minimum of 36 hours in language arts.

* * * * *

Oklahoma. Ordinarily, the approved institutional program for the standard certificate requires 6 to 8 hours of English language and composition; 2-3 hours of speech and 6-8 hours of children's literature, reading methods, and other language arts as a part of 25 hours in specialization. Also, a required minor subject concentration of 18 hours may be in English. The 21 hours of education includes psychology, social foundations, evaluation, student teaching. The provisional and the temporary certificate require an unspecified amount of work in English and in the language arts as a part of the specialization (18 hours for the provisional, 14 hours for the temporary certificate).

1967 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO TEACH ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified. U-R = unspecified-required.

STATE	(1) Minimum College English (including speech, etc.)		Specialized Subject Matter in English Language Arts: (2) Reading Methods		(3) Children's Literature		(4) Language Arts in general		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Alaska	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	24	24
Arizona	6	U	U	3	U	3	6	6	24	24
Colorado	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
D. C.	U	U	U-R	3	U-R	3	12	12	24	24
Florida	8	U	2	2	U	U	U	U	20	20
Georgia	13	U	U	U-R	U	U	3	U	20	20
Hawaii	U	U	U-R	U	U	U	U	U	18 + U	18 + 6G
Iowa	U	U	U	U	U-R	U	U-R	U	20	20
Kansas	12	U	U	U	U	U	U-R	U	24	24
Massachusetts	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	18	18
Michigan	12	U	U	U-R	U	U-R	U-R	U-R	20	20

Alaska. For the regular certificate the 24 hours of education must include 8 hours in elementary methods and a course in student teaching. Provisional and emergency certificates are issued to persons holding a bachelor's degree but lacking some required professional education.

* * * * *

Arizona. Initial certificate, valid 5 years, requires general education in five fields which include communication and humanities; academic concentration may be in English, 30 hours for a major, 12 to 18 hours for a minor. Standard certificate adds to initial certificate requirements: master's degree or 30 hours of approved upper-division or graduate work increasing total professional education to 40 hours. A one-year, non-renewable permit to teach in elementary or secondary school may be issued to holders of a bachelor's degree including 18 hours of professional preparation with student teaching.

* * * * *

Colorado. For the regular certificate (Type A), renewable every 5 years, the teacher may qualify by any of three plans. See details under the Secondary Requirements for Colorado.

* * * * *

District of Columbia. No comment.

* * * * *

Florida. The 20 hours of professional education includes foundations of education, general methods, the teaching of reading, and teaching internship. Instead of the internship of 6 hours, a teacher may present 2 years of teaching with 3 hours of directed teaching or 3 years of teaching. Three ranks of elementary certificate are issued with requirements as follows: Rank III—a bachelor's degree with a major in elementary education or a bachelor's degree with 21 hours in elementary education including materials for teaching children, nature study or science, social studies, health and physical education, art, music, and arithmetic; Rank II—a master's degree with a graduate major in elementary education or a master's degree with 27 hours in elementary education including the areas specified for Rank III; Rank I—a doctor's degree with a doctoral major in elementary education or a doctor's degree with 33 hours (at least 6 at graduate level) in the areas specified for Rank III. For use of examinations in certification, see the note under Secondary Requirements.

* * * * *

Georgia. Data refer to the regular certificate based on a bachelor's degree. Elementary school professional certificates are also issued: one based on a master's degree (which includes 10 hours of educational psychology and curriculum and 17 hours of content supplementing the teaching fields); and one based on a sixth-year program (a year beyond the master's degree). The two years of graduate study should be planned to give the teacher 33 hours of content in the teaching fields, 10 hours of educational psychology, and 10 hours in school programs and problems.

* * * * *

Hawaii. Provisional certificate requires 18 hours of education, the professional certificate 24 hours, of which 6 must be in graduate courses. Besides the courses in education, both certificates require practice teaching or 2 years of teaching experience in the elementary school.

* * * * *

Iowa. Typically, approved institutional programs, all of which provide a general education core of 40 hours and a concentration in an academic area, include English, children's literature, and language arts methods.

* * * * *

Kansas. An initial elementary school certificate, valid three years and after 2 years of teaching renewable for 5 years, is issued on an approved bachelor's degree program which requires 30 hours of general education (including 12 hours of oral and written communications, literature, and foreign languages), 24 hours of professional education, and 15 hours in specialized elementary school content and methods courses (which may include language arts). Subsequent five-year renewals require specified additional experience and college credit. A one-year certificate may be issued to an out-of-state applicant who has a standard certificate based on a degree program that includes 35 hours of general education and 12 hours of professional education.

* * * * *

Massachusetts. No comment.

* * * * *

Michigan. Although preparation for the elementary school certificate varies, approved programs in Michigan institutions require language arts including reading methods and children's literature. The provisional certificate, based on an approved bachelor's degree program, is valid 5 years; with 3 years of teaching under it and an additional 10 hours of college credit, a teacher may be issued a permanent certificate.

1967 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO TEACH ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified. U-R = unspecified-required.

STATE	(1) Minimum College English (including speech, etc.)		Specialized Subject Matter in English Language Arts: (2) Reading Methods		(3) Children's Literature		(4) Language Arts in general		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Minnesota	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	30	30
Montana	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Nevada	U	U	U	2	U	U	U	U	30	30
New Hampshire	U	U	U	3	U	U	U	3	27	24
New York	U	U	U	U-R	U-R	U-R	2	U-R	35+U	40
Oregon	10	U	2	U-R	U	U-R	U	U-R	20	20
Rhode Island	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	30	30+U
Utah	6	U	U	2	U	2	4	6	30	30
Washington	U-R	U-R	U	U	U	U	U-R	U-R	24+U	24+UG
Wisconsin	U	U	U-R	U-R	U	U	U-R	U-R	26	26
Wyoming	6	U	U	U	U	U	10	U	29	23

Minnesota. No comment.

* * * * *

Montana. Requirements for the provisional and the standard certificate, both based on the bachelor's degree, depend upon the program approved for the institution which prepared the teacher. A professional certificate, based on an approved fifth-year program, is also available.

* * * * *

Nevada. Data above apply to the standard certificate. Although course work is not specified, a requirement of 6 hours in basic subjects includes methods of teaching language arts. Upon request of a county superintendent, an emergency elementary certificate may be issued on 2 years of college preparation. This 5-year emergency certificate is not renewable, and the holder must complete the bachelor's degree to remain in teaching. Also, a professional elementary certificate is granted on a master's degree.

* * * * *

New Hampshire. Standard elementary certificate is issued on a bachelor's degree in a program for elementary school teachers. Secondary teachers and liberal arts graduates of accredited colleges must include elementary teaching of reading 3 hours and language arts 3 hours as part of 24 hours of professional education in the requirement for the elementary certificate.

* * * * *

New York. For a teacher in nursery or elementary school through Grade 6, the provisional certificate (valid 5 years) requires 75 hours in liberal arts, 24 hours (6 upper-division or graduate level) in an academic concentration, 24 hours in professional education (with a minimum of 3 hours in the sociological, philosophical, and historical foundations of education, 6 hours in educational and developmental psychology, and 9 hours in instructional materials and methods—including the teaching of the basic skills), and 10 hours (300 clock hours) of supervised teaching. For the same school level, the permanent certificate requires 90 hours in liberal arts, 30 in an academic concentration, 30 in professional education, and 10 of supervised teaching; the graduate study (a master's degree or 30 hours) must include 12 hours in a liberal arts field related to the candidate's teaching and 12 hours in the social and behavioral sciences related to teaching.

For a teacher in nursery school, elementary school, and secondary school through Grade 9, the requirements are the same as those given above, except that for an English teacher 80 clock hours of the 300 hours in supervised teaching must be in English and the academic concentration in English must be at least 30 hours for the provisional certificate, 36 hours for the permanent, including the same areas as those required for the New York secondary school certificate in English (see Secondary School Requirements).

Oregon. Data are for the basic elementary norm. Reading methods is a part of 20 hours in elementary specialization. The limited elementary certificate, issued on a planned five-year college preparation plus teaching experience, requires 30 hours of professional education and an academic concentration of 20 hours which may be in language arts.

* * * * *

Rhode Island. Guidelines for the approved program stipulate only the amount of education, which is 30 hours for the provisional certificate. The fifth year comprises 30 hours in a program of studies (not necessarily professional education) approved for the preparation of elementary school teachers.

* * * * *

Utah. Approved institutional programs for the certificate based on a bachelor's degree require at least 20 percent of the total credit to be in psychology and education, 30 percent in subject matter of the teaching fields, and the rest in general education. The elementary school certificate is valid also in kindergarten on evidence of the appropriate competence and college credit. A professional certificate is issued on 3 years of teaching and an approved fifth year of preparation including 8 hours in subject matter and 8 hours in professional education.

* * * * *

Washington. Guidelines of a 4-year program require 35 percent in liberal arts and sciences, 35 percent in an area of learning applicable to the school (possibly English), 20 percent in education (including language arts methods), and 10 percent in electives. The fifth year (required within 6 years after the teacher begins service) must further the preparation for elementary school teaching, must include academic and professional education.

* * * * *

Wisconsin. An approved program usually includes English in general education and reading methods and language arts as part of education. The teacher with an initial 64-hour certificate must earn the bachelor's degree within 7 years, the 96-hour teacher within 6 years. In 1972 the initial certificate will require a bachelor's degree. For kindergarten certification a teacher must have a bachelor's degree in kindergarten education.

* * * * *

Wyoming. English is part of humanities, and language arts is included in 8 hours of elementary methods, required for the standard certificate. Endorsement of the elementary certificate for kindergarten requires a course on kindergarten teaching, for remedial reading 6 hours in the field. A professional certificate is issued on a master's degree or equivalent and teaching experience.

1967 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
TO TEACH ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified.

STATE	(1) Minimum for full English load		(2) Minimum for part English load (2 classes)		(3) Standard requirement (often larger than minimum)		(4) Allowed for speech, dramatics, journalism		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Washington	40A	40A	40A	40A	40A+	40A+	U	U	24+U	24+UG
Delaware	36	36	24	18	36	36	3	3	18	18
Minnesota	15	36	15	18	24	36A	6	6	18	18
New York	36A	36A	36A	36A	51A	51A	U	U	24	24
North Carolina	30A	36A	30A	36A	30A	36A	6	8	18	18
Pennsylvania	36A	36A	18	18	36A	36A	U	U	18+12G	18+12G
Connecticut	30	30	30	30	30A	30A	12	12	18	18
D. C.	30	30	30	30	30	30	U	12	18	15
Florida	30	30	30	30	30A	30A	6	6	20	20
New Hampshire	30	30	12	12	30	30	U	U	18	18
Puerto Rico	36	30	36	24	36	36	U	U	21	24
Vermont	30	30	30	15	30	30	0	3	18	18

Washington. Guidelines of a 4-year program to prepare the English teacher require 35 per cent in liberal arts and sciences, 35 per cent in the field of English (allowing speech and journalism), 20 per cent in education, and 10 per cent in electives. The fifth year, which must be completed within six years, must further the teacher in English and include academic and professional education.

* * * * *

Delaware. English teaching field requires 36 hours (30 if freshman English is waived), including English literature, 6; American literature, 6; a foreign literature in the original language or English translation, 3; advanced composition, 3; speech, 3; linguistics or modern grammar or history of English language, 3. Highly recommended electives are teaching of reading and children's literature or literature for adolescents.

* * * * *

Minnesota. A full load of English teaching requires a college major in English (typically 36 hours) including one or two courses in speech, etc.; a half load of English requires a minor (18 hours).

* * * * *

New York. Provisional certificate in English requires 36 hours in these areas (not courses): advanced writing; concepts, processes, and media of communication; development, structure, and function of the language; English, American, and world literature; oral interpretation of literature; oral composition; improvement of reading; literary materials for adolescents. Permanent certificate in English requires 15 hours of advanced English. Provisional certificate requires 18 hours of education, the permanent certificate 24 hours. Applied to an English teacher, this requirement in professional education specifies a distribution of 8 hours in the social, philosophical, and psychological foundations of educational theory and practice, 8 hours in materials and methods of teaching English, and 80 class periods (about 2 semester hours) of supervised teaching.

* * * * *

North Carolina. Minimum scores on National Teacher Examinations (common and appropriate field) are also required—in 1968 the minimum is 500 at bachelor's degree level, 600 at master's degree level.

* * * * *

Pennsylvania. To the 36-hour English area of the provisional certificate may be added 6 hours in reading methods for special endorsement. Graduate work must include 12 hours of academic subjects (possibly English) and 12 hours of education. In an emergency, for 3 years an English teacher may have only 18 hours of English.

* * * * *

Connecticut. Data apply to both provisional and standard certificate. Within 10 years the provisional certificate must be converted into the standard, which requires 3 years of teaching and completion of an approved fifth-year program.

* * * * *

District of Columbia. No comment.

* * * * *

Florida. The 20 hours of professional education includes foundations of education, general methods, teaching of English, and teaching internship. Instead of the internship of 6 hours, a teacher may present 2 years of teaching with 3 hours of directed teaching or 3 years of teaching. Three ranks of secondary school English certificate are issued with requirements as follows: Rank III—a bachelor's degree with a major in English or a bachelor's degree with 30 hours in English including freshman English, speech, advanced composition, English grammar, and American and English literature; Rank II—a master's degree with a graduate major in English or a master's degree with 36 hours in English including the areas listed in Rank III; Rank I—a doctor's degree with a doctoral major in English or a doctor's degree with 42 hours (at least 6 at graduate level) in English including the areas in Rank III. Florida uses examinations as prerequisite for regular certification. Minimum scores required are 500 on National Teacher Examinations, 800 on Graduate Record Examination, verbal and quantitative.

* * * * *

New Hampshire. With either a 30-hour major or a 12-hour minor in English, the teacher must have 6 hours in the subject taught. The junior high school certificate requires 9 hours for less than half a load, 18 hours for more, with 6 hours in the subject taught.

* * * * *

Puerto Rico. The certificate cited requires a course in teaching English as a second language.

* * * * *

Vermont. Approved programs at bachelor's level require a major of 30 hours in English as a teaching field and 18 hours of professional education.

1967 SECONDARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
TO TEACH ENGLISH

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified.

STATE	(1) Minimum for full English load		(2) Minimum for part English load (2 classes)		(3) Standard requirement (often larger than minimum)		(4) Allowed for speech, dramatics, journalism		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Virginia	24	30	24	30	U	30	6	12	15	15
Wyoming	24	30	24	18	24	30A	12	6	20	20
Oregon	28	28	20	20	28	28A	U	U	24	24
Arkansas	24	24	12	12	24A	24A	6	6	18	18
Hawaii	24	24	12	12	36A	36A	U	U	18+U	18+6G
Illinois	24	24	24	24	32A	32A	8	8	16	16
Indiana	24	24	24	24	48A	48A	6/40	6/40	18+6G	18+6G
Kansas	24	24	24	24	24A	24A	9	9	20	20
Kentucky	24	24	24	24	30/48A	30/48A	18/48	18/48	17	17+9G

Virginia. The required minimum preparation in the English area (including advanced grammar and English and American literature) increases to 30 hours in July 1968. A postgraduate professional certificate is also granted on the master's or the doctor's degree.

* * * * *

Wyoming. Standard certificate based on a bachelor's degree in an approved program for teachers requires 30 hours in English (allowing 6 hours of journalism and speech) for endorsement to teach in the area. With 30 hours in the field of English, a teacher may obtain an endorsement for journalism with 12 hours of journalism, and for speech with 18 hours of speech and dramatics. Accreditation enforces a minimum of 18 hours in a teaching minor. A professional certificate is granted on a master's degree or equivalent and teaching experience.

* * * * *

Oregon. The 28-hour requirement (basic norm) includes advanced composition; English language; American, English, and world literature; speech; and reading methods. To these areas, the 40-hour requirement (standard norm) adds literary criticism. Twenty hours in these subjects are required of the teacher who has a class combining English and social studies. Initial certificate requires 14 hours of education including special methods; the continuing certificate requires 24 hours of education, which must include the teaching of reading.

* * * * *

Arkansas. The 24-hour area requirement must include 6 hours in subjects taught, such as composition, English literature, American literature. Any one qualified for the standard certificate may qualify for a secondary classroom teacher's master certificate by completion of a master's degree including 6 hours of psychology and education and 18 hours of subject matter courses in fields commonly taught in the secondary school. One-year emergency certificates may be issued to holders of a bachelor's degree who lack specific requirements in professional education, provided they have a certificate teaching field.

* * * * *

Hawaii. Provisional certificate requires a 24-hour major and a 12-hour minor in subject fields. The professional certificate, based on a five-year preparation, requires one teaching field, which for English is 36 hours plus a course in teaching English. Practice teaching is required in addition to 18 hours of educational theory. Professional certificate requires 24 hours of education, including 6 graduate hours.

* * * * *

Illinois. For certification in English a teacher must have 32 hours of college work in the area; for accreditation of the school the English teacher must have 24 hours in the field including 6 hours in rhetoric and composition allowing not more than 8 hours in speech and journalism. He must have at least one course in each subject taught, such as grammar, American literature, English literature, world literature, reading, dramatics.

* * * * *

Indiana. For the provisional certificate: the minor in English is 24 hours including advanced composition, 3; advanced English language study, 3; literature, 12 (English and American required, world literature, 3 hours allowed); but not allowing speech or journalism; and the major is 40 hours including advanced composition, 3; advanced English language study, 5; literature, 20 (English and American required, world literature, 5 allowed); speech, 3; and journalism, 3. For the professional certificate, 8 hours of graduate work in English is required, and the master's degree may be taken in English alone. For junior high school: Provisional certificate requires a 24-hour subject concentration for endorsement on an elementary certificate; or two 24-hour minors, or a combination of 40-hour majors and 24-hour minors, otherwise. Professional certificate requires one 40-hour major and one 32-hour minor, with 8 hours of graduate courses in the major, in the minor, and in each subject endorsement that is converted from provisional to professional status. Provisional certificate requires 24 to 27 hours of education including reading methods; the professional certificate requires 8 hours of education on the master's degree.

* * * * *

Kansas. An initial secondary school certificate, valid 3 years and after 2 years of teaching renewable for 5 years, is issued on an approved bachelor's degree which requires 50 hours of general education (including 12 hours of oral and written communications, literature, and foreign languages) and 20 hours of professional education. Subsequent 5-year renewals require specified additional experience and college credit. A one-year certificate may be issued to an out-of-state applicant who has a standard certificate based on a degree program that includes 35 hours of general education and 12 hours of professional education. The 24-hour minimum in the English area must include 6 hours in each subject taught, one course in speech, and 15 hours in English composition and literature, with at least one course each in American literature and advanced composition. Junior high school teachers must have a minimum of 15 hours in each field taught.

* * * * *

Kentucky. The 24-hour minor and the 30-hour major in English do not ordinarily include speech or journalism, but the accredited college decides. The 48-hour English area contains 18 hours in speech, dramatics, and journalism.

1967 SECONDARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO TEACH ENGLISH

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified.

STATE	(1) Minimum for full English load		(2) Minimum for part English load (2 classes)		(3) Standard requirement (often larger than minimum)		(4) Allowed for speech, dramatics, journalism		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Louisiana	24	24	24	24	36	36	0	0	18	18
Maryland	24	24	24	24	U	24	6	0	18	18
Mississippi	24	24	24	24	30	30A	3	3	18	18
Nebraska	24	24	18	18	U	36A	U	12/36	18	18
Ohio	24	24	24	24	24	24	0	0	17	18
South Carolina	24	24	24	24	U	U	U	U	18	18
Tennessee	24	24	24	24	U	U	0	0	24	24
Texas	24	24	24	24	24	24	0	0	18	18
Wisconsin	22	22	22	22	34	34	U	U	18	18
California	20	20	20	20	24+U	24+U	U	U	15	15
Montana	20	20	20	20	30	30	U	U	16	18
Missouri	19	19	19	19	24A	24A	5/24	5/24	20	20

Louisiana. Certificate to teach English requires 12 hours of English in addition to the general education requirement of English 12 hours. English major is usually 36 hours, minor 30. Certificate to teach speech requires 12 hours of English and 18 hours of speech. Certificate for journalism requires 12 hours of English, 12 hours of journalism.

* * * * *

Maryland. The advanced professional certificate, required after 10 years of teaching under a standard certificate, is issued on a master's degree or an approved program of 34 hours—one half is in content and one half may be in professional education.

* * * * *

Mississippi. The class-A secondary school teacher's certificate, based on an approved bachelor's degree program, requires 12 hours of English and 3 hours of speech as part of 48 hours in general education. For this certificate, the English area of specialization requires 30 hours, which must include 3 hours each in American literature, English literature, Shakespeare, and advanced grammar and composition, and may include 3 hours of speech.

* * * * *

Nebraska. Data in the table refer to the standard certificate based on an approved bachelor's program, which typically requires a major of 24 hours in a subject or 36 hours in an area, with 18 hours of professional education. A minor is usually 18 hours. For endorsement of a certificate in English (Grades 7-12), the requirement is 36 hours in English allowing 12 hours in dramatics, speech, and journalism; for English (Grades 7-9), 24 hours in language arts including a course in methods of teaching reading. A professional certificate is issued on an approved fifth year of college.

* * * * *

Ohio. The 24-hour minimum in English must include composition and language, 9 hours, American and English literature, 12 hours.

* * * * *

South Carolina. The 24-hour requirement includes composition, 6; English literature, 6; and American literature, 6. Speech and journalism are allowed as English if the college counts them on the English major. An endorsement in speech and drama requires 18 hours in the area. A one-year provisional certificate is issued on a bachelor's degree which did not include the required professional education. National Teacher Examinations are used as a prerequisite for initial certification and as an opportunity for teachers to raise the level of their certificate.

* * * * *

Tennessee. Both professional and temporary certificates require 24 hours of English for endorsement. Professional certificate requires 24 hours of education, temporary certificate, 4. For renewal every 2 years, the temporary certificate requires 8 hours of additional credit applicable on the professional certificate. An advanced certificate is issued on a master's degree.

* * * * *

Texas. These minimums apply whether the certificate is based on a 4-year or a 5-year college preparation.

* * * * *

Wisconsin. Minimum preparation approved for the English teaching minor is 22 hours, for the major, 34. Each accredited college determines its specific major and minor—number of hours, pattern of subjects, and allowance for speech and journalism. English methods must be included in the 18 hours of education.

* * * * *

California. A teaching minor in English is 20 hours at any level, a teaching major, 24 hours in upper-division courses. A teacher with an interdepartmental major in humanities may count 15 hours of upper-division or graduate English as a subject major. Regular credential requires 3 years of college; conditional credential (based on bachelor's degree) is limited to a total life of 5 years.

* * * * *

Montana. Requirements for the provisional and the standard certificate, both based on the bachelor's degree, depend upon the program approved for the institution which prepared the teacher. The usual English major is 30 hours; minimums for endorsement in English are a minor of 20 hours in English and 18 hours in professional education.

* * * * *

Missouri. The regular 24-hour English certificate includes composition, rhetoric, and grammar, 5 hours; American literature, 5; English or world literature, 5; and allows 5 hours of speech. The provisional certificate requires 19 hours of English, allowing 5 hours of speech; it permits a 5-hour deficiency in education.

1967 SECONDARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO TEACH ENGLISH

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified.

STATE	(1) Minimum for full English load		(2) Minimum for part English load (2 classes)		(3) Standard requirement (often larger than minimum)		(4) Allowed for speech, dramatics, journalism		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
Alabama	18	18	18	18	30A	30A	6	6	24	21
Arizona	18	18	18	18	30	30	U	5	24	30
Maine	18	18	18	18	30/50A	30/50A	U	U	18	18
Massachusetts	18	18	9	9	U	18	U	U	12	12
New Jersey	18	18	18	18	24A	24A	6	U	18+U	18
New Mexico	24	18	24	18	24/36A	54A	U	36	28	28
Oklahoma	24	18	18	18	32A	32A	8/32	8/32	21	21
Rhode Island	18	18	18	18	30	30A	U	U	18+U	18+U
West Virginia	24	18	18	18	U	36A/50A	2	3/20	20	20
Nevada	16	16	16	16	30A	30A	6	6	18	18

Alabama. 1967 data in table are for class-B secondary professional certificate, valid eight years. Basic requirements include one course in speech. Class-A secondary professional certificate, valid 10 years, requires a master's degree including six hours in English and 6 hours in education; class-AA secondary professional certificate, valid 12 years, requires completion of a sixth-year program (a year beyond the master's degree) in a standard institution approved for a doctoral degree. All three classes of certificate may be continued upon evidence of a specified period of successful teaching or additional study.

* * * * *

Arizona. High school accreditation enforces 18-hour English minimum. Initial certificate, valid 5 years, requires 30-hour area in English (with 5 hours allowed in speech and related subjects) and 22 hours in professional education. Standard certificate requires (beyond an appropriate bachelor's degree) a master's degree or 30 hours of approved upper-division or graduate work for secondary school teachers. A one-year, nonrenewable permit to teach in elementary or secondary school may be issued to holders of a bachelor's degree including 18 hours of professional preparation with student teaching.

* * * * *

Maine. Under the blanket certificate a teacher may be assigned to teach English without endorsement, but accrediting officials expect the teacher to be prepared in the teaching field. The basic program of teacher education requires a major field of 30 hours plus a minor of 18 hours, or a 50-hour area of specialization.

* * * * *

Massachusetts. No comment.

* * * * *

New Jersey. Regular certificate, valid 5 years, requires an 18-hour minor to teach English. Permanent certificate requires a 24-hour major for English endorsement. Besides 18 semester hours of educational theory, student teaching for 150 clock hours is required, 90 of which must be classroom teaching.

* * * * *

New Mexico. Provisional certificate, which may be extended for a total use of 8 years, requires as part of the bachelor's degree 18 hours of professional education and one of four plans for teaching fields, namely (1) two fields of 24 hours each, (2) a field of 24 hours and two fields of 18 hours each, (3) a composite field of 36 hours and a field of 18 hours, (4) one composite of 54 hours. The continuing 5-year secondary certificate, based on a planned, 5-year college program with 30 graduate hours, requires 28 hours of professional education and for language arts teachers in high school, a minimum of 36 hours in language arts with at least 10 hours in each subject taught, such as dramatics, journalism, speech, reading.

* * * * *

Oklahoma. Approved program must require 32 hours in the area of English, including 8 hours of speech and journalism and 24 hours of composition, linguistics, and English, American, and world literature. Provisional certificate requires 20 hours, temporary certificate, 18 hours in the area. High school accreditation standards require the English teacher to have 18 hours in the field, with 6 hours in the subject taught. Special methods may be part of the English area or of the 21 hours required in education for the standard certificate. The provisional certificate (valid 3 years, not renewable) requires 15 hours of education, the temporary certificate 12 hours.

* * * * *

Rhode Island. Provisional certificate requires 18 hours of English for endorsement; the professional certificate, which must be earned within 6 years of teaching, requires 30 hours in English as a teaching area.

* * * * *

West Virginia. Provisional and professional certificates require 36 hours of English as a teaching field, allowing 3 hours in speech. A comprehensive certificate in language arts, issued on 50 hours, includes 30 hours of English, 15 hours of speech, and 5 hours of journalism. Both types of certificate require 20 hours of professional education.

* * * * *

Nevada. For high school accreditation the Northwest Association requires that the teacher of English have 16 hours in the field, with 6 hours in the subject taught. Standard certificate is based on a bachelor's degree with 18 hours of professional education and a major and a minor in recognized teaching fields. A professional certificate is also issued on a master's degree. Provisional secondary certificates are granted upon request of a county superintendent; the teacher's total deficiencies in preparation cannot exceed 6 hours and must be removed within one year.

1967 SECONDARY SCHOOL CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS TO TEACH ENGLISH

Expressed in Semester Hours

A = area. G = graduate credit. U = unspecified.

STATE	(1) Minimum for full English load		(2) Minimum for part English load (2 classes)		(3) Standard requirement (often larger than minimum)		(4) Allowed for speech, dramatics, journalism		(5) Professional Education (standard certificate)	
	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967	1964	1967
North Dakota	16	16	16	16	U	32A	5	6	16	16
Idaho	15	15	15	15	30A	30A	18	18	20	20
Iowa	15	15	15	15	30	30A	0	U	20	20
Michigan	15	15	15	15/18	24	24	U	U	20	20
South Dakota	15	15	15	15	24A	25A	9/24	10/25	20	20
Utah	12	15	12	15	20/40A	15/42A	0	27/42A	18	21
Alaska	16	12	16	12	U	U	U	U	18	18
Colorado	18	12/18	18	12/18	major	major	U(3)	U	U	U
Georgia	12	12	U	12	30A	30A	9	10	20	20

North Dakota. Although the blanket certificate does not stipulate the requirement, accreditation standards require the high school to have an English teacher with 16 hours in the field, allowing 6 hours in speech and journalism. The accredited college defines the major in English.

* * * * *

Idaho. An endorsement to teach English (whether it is based on a 30-hour major or 20-hour minor) requires composition, 6 hours; American and English literature, 6 hours. Provisional certificate requires 9 hours of education, the standard certificate 20 hours.

* * * * *

Iowa. Typically, approved institutional programs provide a general education core of 40 hours and a concentration in an academic area including courses designed to give competence in the subject taught. Preparation to teach English as a major subject usually comprises 30 hours in the area. Records of applicants with credits from a college outside Iowa are evaluated for each teaching area by comparison with standards typical of approved programs in Iowa colleges.

* * * * *

Michigan. Approved teacher education programs in institutions of the state usually exceed the minimum requirements of the State Board of Education, which are 15 hours for a minor and 24 hours for a major in English. (See note under Elementary Requirements, for statement about provisional and permanent certificate.)

* * * * *

South Dakota. Speech and journalism are not allowed as part of the 15-hour minimum but may be 10 hours of the 25-hour language arts area.

* * * * *

Utah. Approved institutional programs for the certificate based on a bachelor's degree require at least 17 per cent of the total credit to be in psychology and education, 34 per cent in subjects taught, and the rest in general education. A professional certificate is issued on 3 years of teaching and an approved fifth year of preparation including 8 hours in subject matter and 8 hours in professional education.

* * * * *

Alaska. For the regular certificate the 18 hours in education must include 3 hours in secondary methods and a course in student teaching. Provisional and emergency certificates are issued to persons holding a bachelor's degree but lacking some professional education required. Northwest Association requires accredited high schools to have English teachers with a minimum of 16 hours in language arts, including 6 hours in the subject taught.

* * * * *

Colorado. State accreditation of schools requires 12 hours to teach English, North Central Association, 18 hours. For the regular certificate (Type A), renewable every 5 years, the teacher may qualify by any of three plans: (1) completion of an approved program of teacher education through the bachelor's degree, plus recommendation of the institution attended; (2) regular employment in Colorado schools for 5 years before 1961; (3) completion of baccalaureate degree and successful performance on an examination approved by the Colorado Board of Education, plus 5 years of teaching. For the professional certificate (Type B), renewable every 10 years; a person qualified for the regular certificate must complete 3 years of teaching and a planned program of one or more years of work leading to an advanced degree, plus institutional recommendation.

* * * * *

Georgia. Data in table refer to the regular certificate based on a bachelor's degree. School accreditation requirements enforce a 12-hour minimum for teaching English. Secondary school professional certificates are also issued: one based on a master's degree with 10 hours of educational psychology and curriculum and 17 hours of content in the teaching fields; and one based on a sixth-year program. The two years of advanced study should be planned to give the teacher 33 hours in the content of the teaching fields, 10 hours in educational psychology, and 10 hours in school program and problems.